LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
FEB 25 1953
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BD701
.E53

THE NAMIC PHILOSOPHY

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
FEB 25 1953
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

JOHN EMBRY

THE NAMIC PHILOSOPHY

A Philosophy of Reality and Religion

Philosophical Library - New York

Copyright, 1951, by John Embry
3827 Classen, Oklahoma City 6, Oklahoma

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Printed in the United States of America

DEDICATED TO MY WIFE,

CORA McCREARY EMBRY,

WITH WHOM I HAVE LIVED HAPPILY

FOR MORE THAN A HALF-CENTURY

CONTENTS

Pages

Preface 3-5

CHAPTER I: *Introduction* 7-21

I. Definition; II. Theories of Aristotle; III. God the Father; IV. Particulars of the Phenomenal World

CHAPTER II: *Survey of Sense and Thought* 22-45

I. Consciousness and Reality; II. The Cosmic Order; III. Phenomenal Activities; IV. Epistemological Idealism, with mentions of Berkeley, Fichte, Bergson, Hegel, and others; V. Epistemological Realism, with mentions of Locke, Hume, James, ant, and others; VI. The Critical Philosophy of Immanuel Kant

CHAPTER III: *Logical Forms of Thought* 46-55

I. Definitions; II. Universals and General Notions; III. Reasoning from Analogy; IV. Induction; V. Deduction; VI. Practical Reasoning; VII. Pragmatic Philosophy

CHAPTER IV: *Certain Philosophies and Religion* 56-75

I. States of Knowledge; II. Linear Sequence ande Namic Transcendency; III. Immanent Reason in the World; IV. Theories of Spinoza; V. Eastern or Hindu Philosophy; VI. Neo-Platonism; VII. Some Classical Philosophies; VIII. Materialism; IX. Religion

Pages

CHAPTER V: *Extension in its Mechanical Aspects* 76-81

I. Mechanism in its general significance; II. Energetics; III. Conservation of Energy; IV. Heat Energy; V. Physio-Chemical Forces

CHAPTER VI: *Vitality and Biological Extension* 82-88

1. The Vital Order of the Real; II. Heredity; III. Activities of the Organism; IV. The Law of Biogenesis; V. Animal Life

CHAPTER VII: *Theories of Mind* 89-94

CHAPTER VIII: *Psychology and Intuition* 95-101

I. Psychology as a Science; II. Instinct and Intuition

CHAPTER IX: *Evolution* 102-119

I. Teleological View of Evolution; II. Theories of Herbert Spencer; III. Meliorism

CHAPTER X: *God, The Almighty* 120-127

I. The Spiritual Interpretation of the Real; II. Hebraic Ideas; III. St. Paul's Characterization of the Law

CHAPTER XI: *The Spiritual Development of Israel under Divine Tutelage* 128-148

I. The Divine Guidance; II. Recurring to the History of Israel; III. The Prophetic Reforms; IV. The Prophetic Idealism of Israel

CHAPTER XII: *Christ, The Son of God* 149-179

I. The Idealism of Israel was fufilled in our Lord Jesus Christ; II. Revelation of God in Christ; III. The Humility of Christ; IV. Saying of Jesus; V. Christian Science

CHAPTER XIII: *The Divine Immanence* 180-190

I. The Spiritual Character and Experience of Mankind; II. The Divine Immanence in the Office of the Holy Spirit

Namic Philosophy

Pages

CHAPTER XIV: *The Christian Ethic* 191-197

CHAPTER XV: *The New Testament* 198-230

I. The Canon; II. The Traditions followed by observations on Unitarianism, Marxism, Mohammedanism; III. The Moral Concept; IV. Namic Philosophy

Index 231-238

THE NAMIC PHILOSOPHY

PREFACE

This exposition of reality and religion covers such wide range of subjects, and many of them so interrelated, that only a topical classification is attempted.

It may be characterized a Namic Philosophy, namic meaning Action.

Touching reality, there must necessarily exist a unity of force transcending the limitations of phenomenal particulars, in which the ultimate relations of such particulars obtain; a force involving and distributing particulars, mutable things, as classes or species in a hierarchy of law; and thus phenomena manifesting the order in nature.

And touching these, notice is taken of the principle of universality as a principle in the relations of things, and as the criterion of truth in formal logic; of practical reason and the empirical and phenomenal sciences; and of *necessity* as a criterion of truth, and especially of the truth of creation frequently implicit in the concept of namic transcendency, a concept more fully defined later, but which in its last analysis means the predominance of the namic (the more active) over the relatively static; while sequences in the operations of natural laws are regarded as coming within the limits of a principle which we shall call "Linear sequence" meaning the sequences following, in series, the forces producing them.

And man (meaning the species, male and female), an epitome of nature, is recognized as one of such mentioned species, and considered as susceptible of being analysed, in thought, as having intellectual powers of mind enabling him to acquire knowledge, to reason, and to form judgments, and as having, in common with the higher animals, the capacity of sensory experience, and in common with all animals, sensibility, instinct, and matter incorporated in his physical body.

This exposition proceeds upon the hypothesis that nature determines these characteristics of man according to the laws of organic life. But that life, in its higher significance, is spirit; and that man has the moral liberty of spirit invoking the applications of ethical and spiritual laws in relations above the organic; and in spirit relations with God, in whom he "lives, and moves, and has his being."

A range of subjects touching these propositions is considered herein. And also subjects pertaining to man's consciousness of his own existence, of successive experiences, and of environment external to himself.

Also the discipline called "Epistemology," the theory of knowledge, embracing the theory of epistemological idealism, the doctrine that the world is mind, or that which is of the character of mind; and the theory of epistemological realism, the doctrine that there is a world independent of man's experience.

And the alleged difference between positive knowledge and knowledge in metaphysical states. And the phenomenal sciences—factual and normative, are developed sufficiently to show the values of phenomena and their laws. This in relation to the principles of "namic transcendency" and "linear sequence."

Namic transcendency may be defined in terms of the functions of a positive, dominant force involving in its effects, as if they

were its own, the minor and servient functions of relatives to it; as vitality involving the mechanism of matter in the unity of life; or in terms of the power of an absolutely infinite being or force, transcending the limitations of, but nevertheless effectively involving the finite, as within its principle.

A survey of sense and thought, including logical forms of thought, is made. Notice is taken of philosophies, religion, mechanical aspects of the extensions of things, vitality and biological extension, and traditions of the Hebrew and Christian faiths.

When we think of the Real as an object of thought or knowledge, the object fills the whole conception; and if we would describe it, we must analyze it into its components, and take notice of these and of their respective characters, relations, functions, and of the forces synthesizing the whole.

Such analysis introduces the idea of an Infinite accounting for the adequacy of being, and involving the finite, the severalties in nature within the limitations of phenomena and the government of natural laws. And thus we come to finite aspects of the real which we apprehend as wholes in themselves; and, therefore, of man as an epitome of nature. Now, to describe man other than as an object of thought, we must analyze him, as hereinbefore stated, and posit spirituality, in which the Infinite, God, and the person are related, man "living and moving and having his being in God." Such is the fundamental hypothesis of this essay. And we submit that it is fully justified by the expositions following.

JOHN EMBRY

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

I.

DEFINITION—The real is that which actually exists, as distinguished from the theoretical and imaginary.

The finite real consists of things; that is, of entities and forces within the limitations and subject to the operations of natural laws; natural law being defined as the manner of the uniform operation of entities and forces in nature; a uniformity of sequences in nature reflecting a determinism and continuance; the idea being that like conditions are uniformly followed by like consequences.

The whole of such entities and forces constitute the universe a cosmic system, manifesting a phenomenal world embraced in the term "nature."

It may be said that a phenomenon is something directly visible or observable, as a thing, an appearance, action, change, or an entity referable to some law distinguishable from the force by and the law according to which it is produced. And in that sense we use the term unless the context indicates otherwise.

Touching an alleged difference between the real and pheno-

mena, some philosophers hold that we can know phenomena in the sense of appearance, but that things-in-themselves, called noumena by Kant, are unknowable. But the mind acts as if aware of the reality of the event or thing apprehended.

The phenomenal world or universe can not be taken as the whole of the real; but rather that aspect of it that is limited and governed by natural laws.

However, the whole of the real comes within the purview of the principle of namic transcendency. The term "namic" pertains to action as distinguished from structure; and "namicity" is the quality or capacity of a thing to act.

Substance is the substratum or essence which underlies and is capable of having attributes or producing phenomena. Substance and its attributes may, as a thing, be considered a static real, or substance may be regarded as a positive having namic significance. And an element or entity dominant or inclusive of that which is passive to it or which determines the dominant character of a thing or situation may be called a positive.

The vitality of a living thing is its positive constituent; for without it the embodying matter and organs would not be so organized, or the individuality of the thing obtain.

Nor can we conceive the existence of the several, separate forces and entities in nature other than as dependents in environment in an order determined in an infinite *more* inclusive of it, imparting determinacy to nature in the distribution of its several separate species in a hierarchy of laws; among which species is man, having rational understanding, moral liberty of spirit, and consciousness of personal responsibilities.

Reciprocal actions of dissimilar relata come within the purview of namic philosophy; a philosophy of action. Action imports an actor and an effect or effects.

The exertion of life imports a living thing and its vital activities, in a life, the positive element raising matter to consonance with itself in the creation of an organism, and in specializing the matter as its facilities. Thus the positive and the consonant constituents of a living thing.

If an entity is a piece of matter, it is said to have properties, the source of its potentiality; but if a living thing, it is a unamic entity, as distinguished from a material one; and it has, in addition to the properties of its matter, vital potentials actualized in the exertion of living; and, perchance, sensibility, instinct, sensory experience; and if a man, he has all these and spirit manifested in will and in rational and moral cognition and judgments, and, therefore, he is a living soul.

Matter appears to be a configuration of mass and energy. Mass is the quantity in a piece of matter, and is said to represent energy; and it is said that energy has mass.

Action may be dynamic, the action of two or more physical entities or forces; or it may be unamic, as in the action of a living thing.

Touching dynamic action, it is said that to every physical action there is a corresponding reaction. Such is dynamic action; as is also the reciprocal action of two or more entities or forces, of different potentials, in such effective relations that they set up gradients of energy overcoming their respective inertia and effecting the integration of matter and the dissipation of motion, or the disintegration of matter and the absorption of motion.

Dynamic action involves two or more effective factors; and the dynamic circumstance releasing kinetic energy—energy in motion, is the first phase of a mechanical process, and the result following is the second or resolution phase of such process. Physical energy, dependent as it is on the properties of matter in

effecting dynamic action, is only rudimentary in the mechanical process.

The principle of force within the mechanical limitations is "mechanical equivalence," whence the equivalence of the nature of physical forces notwithstanding they may differ in quantity or intensity.

As to types of such forces, equivalence means, in chemistry, the quality of chemical elements combining with or excluding one another in certain definite proportions; and in the doctrine of forces, that a force of one kind may be transformed into a force of another kind of the same value.

Mass seems to be an encasement of energy. The atomic structure, long thought impervious to any force, may be broken down, releasing from certain minerals enormous amounts of energy. And such energy has mass of its own in form of electrical charges or corpuscles carrying such charges, and neutrons. Matter combining proves a great conservator of energy; that is, it seems that electrical elements combining form atoms, atoms combining form molecules, molecules combining form grosser bodies of matter, and these combining form worlds, planets, and other astronomical bodies, slowing down the expenditure of energy.

On the other hand, there is namicity in the unity of life.

A living thing is a unamic being, consisting of its positive (vital) and its consonant (material or mechanical) elements; and therein obtains the unity of the laws of its nature; the higher functions involving the functions of the lower, as if their own, in the effects reflecting the character of such thing—its individuality rather than its matter.

The action of a living thing is the action of a unity; and is a unamic action, as distinguished from the dynamic action of two or more material entities or forces. A living thing is, by scientific

usage, called an organism, connoting organization; but from the namic point of view it is a vital positive determining its own pattern of being; and it may be called a unant or unamic entity.

Life is the positive or transcendent element of such unant, to which matter, as such, is negative; but it is affected by the vital force of the individual as relative to the life, and is incorporated in the organism as a consonant or mechanical element. An instance of the transcendental of the real overcoming its mechanism.

The bion or living thing is an individual characterized by definiteness and independence of function. It is more than a mere "togetherness" of substance; it is a vital positive character by which its respective organs and functions are what they are.

The mode of the operation of vital force is not that of "equivalence"; but that of "namic transcendency."

Usually an architect prepares the plans and specifications for a house before the house is built. Likewise nature manifests architectural patterns or principles which are exemplified in the building of an organism. Vitality, in its function, transcending but nevertheless involving effectively the embodying matter, imparts to the new creation a potency transcending the mechanism of matter. This and any impetus greater than the impetus of a relative we call "namic transcendency." Namic transcendency is manifest in any relation in which an entity or force, or an element of either, or all together, effectively involve entities or forces passive to them; or produce results transcending the entities or forces acted upon, though they may be integrated in the new character so produced; and in every case in which a dominant entity or force transcends a servient one which it involves effectively.

Now, namicity is the capacity of a thing to act. The idea is not

identical with that of energy. But energy, rudimentary or vital, or both, are elements in namic action. In the mechanical action of matters, the energy is rudimentary, and its pronounced phenomena are motion and relativity. A living thing has, in addition to the energy of its matter, positive quality; that vital quality having the impetus of ancestral patterns in growth potentials, maturity character, propagation of the same kind, and other functions appropriate to the life of the species to which the organism belongs.

Therefore, the organsm has quality, the quality of the species to which it belongs. This is in consequence of what, for the want of a better name, we may call its vital substantiality or positive, constituting the state we call living, with its physical facilities in serviency to the whole.

The energy of the organism is more than mere rudimentary energy raised to a higher function. It is positive in the unicity of the life in the exertion of living, growth potentials, character determinations, and other functions; therein transcending the chemical and mechanical properties of the involved matter.

The vital is not so phenomenally appreciable as the material; but the integrity of the organism in its entirety, a specific creature in its state of life, clearly phenomenally distinguishable from mere matter, presents a value manifesting the additative essential, vitality, as its dominant namicity acting upon and transforming the material to the rhythm of the life.

II.

Theories of Aristotle — According to Aristotle's metaphysical theories, the real is that which is effected by a transition from a condition of potentiality to a condition of actuality by some

form of motion, implying a moving cause; and that as any given moving cause implies an antecedent cause, the causal regress would be endless were we not to posit a Prime Cause or Unmoved Mover, which is also referred to as God.

That the Unmoved or Prime Mover is the origin and source of all motion and life; and that as motion is eternal, so is the Unmoved Mover. That form and matter are two aspects of individual things, and are not separable except in thought; and that such principles are present in all things, except in God, or the Prime Mover, who is pure form. That form is the moving principle of development, and matter is the passive potential. That the Prime Mover and formless stuff are the extreme principles of the cosmos; and that the activity of the Prime Mover is pure thought, causing motion only as an ideal towards which matter strives in the processes of nature.

The term "form" may be used objectively to denote the sum of qualities which makes a thing what it is; which is probably what Aristotle meant when he referred to "form" as a principle of development. And the term may also be used subjectively to express an idea the mind entertains of an object or figure.

The doctrine of form is, in a sense, a departure from the Platonic doctrine of ideas. Plato accepted the Socratic concept that the general notion or universal idea is distinguishable from the sensation or perception, which latter is a particular. That the content of such idea is rational thought or scientific knowledge, and that such idea is stable and has universal validity, while the sensation or perception merely gives sense experience and is variable.

But Plato went further; he hypostatized the idea, holding it to be the archetype of the real, a kind of notional entity; and that the particular is real to the extent it participates in the idea.

Aristotle accepted the Socratic principle, but rejected the hypostatization of ideas, holding that the first real is in the particular.

There is something to be said for both theories in so far as they pertain to concrete particulars. There is a positive of the organism, inclusive of its several separate particulars or organs and functions, which particulars manifest observable phenomena, and each real in itself; while the idea of unity, importing a positiveness more than a mere togetherness, though real, is only inferable from the fact of an end result in the symmetry of the whole.

And there is such logical relation between the particular and the generalization or universal idea that the generalization is true of the particular in its larger relations. The generalization is the constant of that class of things.

Touching form as a principle of organic development, life is the dominant aspect, the character-positive, to which the matter is servient, for an organism is an individual phenomenal unity, of the character of its highest determination, which coordinates its lower processes and functions; and it is of that nature in consequence of the nature of the species to which it belongs and dominant in the course of development. These levels of character signify the essence of things themselves, and are not to be confused with the mechanical.

Approaching the subject from the viewpoint of the passive, the properties of oxygen and of hydrogen are such as to furnish the potential conditions for the actualization of water, in the combination of these elements. Such water is a unity with properties differing from those of its components, but it is a unity in diversity; for it can be decomposed into such original elements by processes exemplifying the mechanical principles of equivalence in transformation. But such is not true of organisms of the

several species of life prevalent in nature; for an organism is, during the cycle of its life, a unity in its entirely—in its lineage, its unamic exertion of living, its structures, and in its biologic and psychic functions, and the forces of its several capacities are super-inclusive of their respective physical organs, aspects of the potency of the whole of the life, in the symmetry of which its organs function.

This congeries of forces obtain in the unity of a state of life, which may be called the vital-positive, the impetus of which follows ancestral patterns.

And while the electrical, chemical, and physical sciences treat of laws of nature reducible or explainable mechanically, the additional laws of biology are in respect of living things. And in addition to these, the psychic must be considered in explanation of intelligence. Above the physical base is the vital *more* that effects the organization of the individual into its unity of entirety. Such is not due to the properties of matter; but to the operation of a namicity through phylogenetic systems propagating definite species through successive generations, in the course of which every protoplasmic cell streamed in growth potentials and otherwise to contribute to a greater than itself; to an individual in whom such *more* is realized.

The organism does not reciprocate with matter, as one chemical element with another; it is a dominant appropriating matter to its use. And these effects presuppose intelligence and design as well as power, in the First Cause.

III.

God, the Father—The implications of the concepts "Unmoved Mover" and "motion" are limited and not coextensive with the whole meaning of the idea of fundamental reality, the finite of which are the whole phenomena of the universe, including life and motion in their various manifestations.

Spirit in man implies that spirit is characteristic of the source of his becoming.

The Hebraic conception, followed by Christian thought, is that "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," and that He created man (meaning the species, male and female) in His own image.

From the Christian viewpoint, St. Paul, writing to the Corinthian Christians, gave the spiritual interpretation of the problem, as follows: "For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth (as there be gods many, and lords many). But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." I Corinthians 8:5, 6.

St. Paul's conception of God is expressive of divine Personality; a great advance over the notion of Aristotle.

The term "reality" signifies that which really exists; the absolute of being or condition of existence as well as particular states of being. Therefore, a unity in which the absolute transcends, but nevertheless includes, the particulars in nature.

Such unity is not mechanical, in which one real excludes another; it must be resolved on a basis of action; God the Eternal involving the severalties of the universe.

The ideas of Aristotle and the ideas of Paul were not from the

same viewpoint. Aristotle thought of the organic world, the relative reality. His logic was analytic, discovering general laws by induction and definition, and the relations of particulars and universals by deduction. And while he had to assume a primal cause of the real, he could think of it, on his premise, as only an Unmoved Mover. While St. Paul could, without disparaging the phenomenal universe studied by Aristotle, realize the Spiritual.

Jesus said: "God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must must worship him in spirit and in truth." John 4:24.

IV.

Recurring to particulars in our phenomenal world, there is an ascending scale of life, from matter to mankind, of higher forms transcending lower ones, in which each character is an individual, adapted, in the form of its species, to its environment; and propagating its kind.

Touching knowledge and understanding—The intellect of the person, inclusive of understanding and reason, should be distinguished from sensibility. Intellect is a character capacity or function, a function characteristic of a species.

Sensibility is common to animate life; and it is a capacity of the person to have sensations, viz., the power of the organs and tissues of the body to cause changes inherent or excited in them to be perceived and recognized by the mind; and this in virtue of the power of mind to resolve sensations into representations of the stimulus source or things of attention, and thus effect cognition of such objects.

Such particular representations are variable experiences; but many of them are so similar that they have many qualities in

common; and the mind effects mental concepts of different categories or classes, into one of which every such particular, according to its common qualities, must fall; leaving unnoticed the minor dissimilarities of such particulars. And if the concept of any such class is distributed, that is, equally applicable to each of its particular components, taken separately, it is a general notion; and in every case, when taken in its full extension, it is a universal idea. This idea is one remove from the concrete experience; for it is a mental concept to denote a class having characteristic qualities in common.

It is thought that these general notions or ideas are truer of the real than are the variable particular experiences. So the understanding ventures in the broad field of thought to systematize its knowledge of the real; and in doing so, it comes to certain concepts that it considers fundamental; at least in so far as the natural and positive sciences require basic truth in scientific thinking. But reason does not desist at this; for it ventures to philosophize, to investigate the ultimate nature and relations of these fundamental concepts.

This part of philosophy is called metaphysics; and thus a further remove from the concrete experience, and more abstract than the general notion or valid universal idea.

Metaphysics pertains to the most general principles; one division called ontology, pertains to the most abstract conceptions of reality and Being; and one, called cosmology, pertains to the more concrete aspects of the world. Metaphysics, as a science, is that part of philosophy that investigates the ultimate nature and relations of fundamental conceptions.

And, in addition, is the consciousness of moral liberty and Will in the choice between alternatives of conduct, revealing the spiritual nature of man and his personal responsibility in the

life and society that are his. Thence a field of thought that is consistent with the theory that this spiritual nature of man marks a spiritual relation with God, above the phenomena of the organic, and is governed by ethical and spiritual laws, necessitating the consideration of religion along with reality in general.

Now, descriptive knowledge is analytic, and we have had to refer to things described as if consisting of parts; but nature does not do things that way; and notwithstanding its varieties of patterns, each pattern is one piece of its kind of reality.

The two classes of the sciences: The phenomenal sciences treating of phenomena and their laws and the relations of concepts representing such data; and metaphysics as a first science touching the ultimate natures and relations of fundamental concepts.

Psychology, for instance, is a descriptive phenomenal science in so far as it pertains to psychic facts susceptible of scientific verification; but when it ventures to explain the conditions under which psychic phenomena occur, it becomes a branch of metaphysics, a metaphysical philosophy. But it is still limited by the kind of reality to which it pertains. And it may be said that all of the classical philosophies are limited in like manner.

But when the fundamental concept is of a sequence of disparate forces in the same unit of action, action involving a cause or causes transcending but nevertheless effectively involving more passive situations, the former transforming the latter to its use or character likeness, the idea of the sameness of kind gives way to that of the superior potentiality of the transcending cause. And we think that such justifies the idea of a namic philosophy, a philosophy of the more primal in the becoming of states of entities cognizable in phenomenal relations. The vegetable, transcending, acts upon and transforms the inorganic to

its use; likewise the animal transcends, but effects and transforms the vegetable to its use. No analysis of the substances,—"inorganic," "vegetable," or "animal," would disclose the transmutation of the lower into the higher form; but the cause in each case, from the empirical viewpoint, is the greater potential of the higher form, in virtue of which it, though transcending the lower, nevertheless effectively involves it. This comes within the idea of creation implicit in the concept of namic transcendency. But such is only a secondary cause in nature. But creation by cause not predicable except from results may reflect a more primary cause. Nature distributes its entities and forces, differentiating characters in the ascending scale of life; each higher character reflecting the actualization of potentials not present in lower forms, as if in consequence of an extra creative namicity, though the lower may contribute some facilities of the higher manifestations; and when mankind is reached, life in its highest is realizable only in accordance with ethical and spiritual principles. This, as if "namic transcendency" were an eternal principle pointing the line of creative forces in respect of structure and functions, and the adaptations of creations in their respective relations to the whole, with matter at the physical base. A universal philosophy must be comprehensive of these and of similar data; and, in general, recognize that finite reality is determined in both matter and spirit, as is manifest in man; and that primal origin or absoluteness of existence must be attributed to a universal cause adequate to such states of being.

Speaking of causes, the idea of efficient cause is implicit in the concept of linear sequence. And such is a presupposition of the phenomenal sciences and of the metaphysical inductions coming within that category, and of metaphysics as a first science.

But the several laws of the different sciences and the diversi-

ties of the mutable things governed by them would result in such chaos as would destroy the efficiencies of all involved factors but for underlying forces effecting their unities in a cosmic order. And, therefore, the inference of final cause, defined as the science or doctrine of "final cause" (a slightly different thought approach to the idea of primal cause); that is, that things are conditioned for the ends which they fulfill. Comporting with the theory of teleology, a manner of explanation that the world or parts within it are due to the realization of ends or purpose.

Infinite Cause—The severalties in nature constitute an ensemble of the universe in which each is in causal relations with its environment and also referable to the whole for its existence; a consequent of infinite cause. The infinitude of such cause defies anlysis, requiring the conception of a unity inclusive of the finite as the expression of its actuality, and spiritual in character as well as positive in power, determining finite things according to their respective characters and functions, and mankind in both matter and spirit and, therefore, God the Father, bringing the spiritual as well as the phenomenal within human experience; scientific and philosophical knowledge developing according to their own laws, and moral and social knowledge developing according to ethical and spiritual laws.

CHAPTER TWO

SURVEY OF SENSE AND THOUGHT

THIS SURVEY NOTICES THE TOPICS—Consciousness and Reality. The Cosmic Order, Phenomenal Activities, and Epistemology.

Epistemology, or theory of knowledge, treats of the origin, nature and development of knowledge, and of its validity in its relations with general experience.

When taken as an idealism, it is the doctrine that the world is mind or that which is of the character of mind, and that experience should be interpreted accordingly. But as a realism, it is the doctrine that there is a world independent of our experience.

Touching idealism, references are made to Berkeley, Fichte, Bergson, Hegel; and with respect to the realistic idea, mentions are made of the categories of Aristotle and of the Critical Philosophy of Immanuel Kant, one of the German philosophers; following which are references to other philosophies and to religion.

Kant divided knowledge into empirical knowledge; that knowledge derived from experience; and into knowledge *a priori,* that is, knowledge not derived from experience, but consisting of pure conceptions of the understanding. Kant considered his categories of the understanding as pure concepts.

But nothing having any empirical element mixed up with it is pure *a priori* knowledge. For instance, the example, "Every change has a cause," is a proposition *a priori;* but impure, because the concept "change" can be derived only from experience.

However, it is regarded as a proposition *a priori,* as distinguished from propositions entirely empirical, for it does contain a rational conclusion, that is, it states a rule to which we know of no exception. It is what Comte called positive knowledge, and is accepted with the confidence attaching to the major premise in a syllogism. But it is not absolutely universal; only comparatively so, by induction.

I.

Consciousness and Reality—Every one is conscious of his or her existence, of successive experiences, and of living in a real world.

Metaphysics and scientists differ in some respects about what constitutes reality, or the more important aspects of the real. Metaphysicians are inclined to regard phenomena and reality as different, emphasizing the essence or substance of things as distinguishable from phenomena. While the scientist is inclined to regard phenomena as reflecting the real in all respects essential to his purposes.

Touching cognition, which is an act of knowing, the sensation in the transmission of stimuli through nerves and brain is a physical movement, but the apprehension of the significance of such movement is a mental act, a cognition of some phase of reality in the stimulus source. (The term "sensation" is also employed to denote sense cognition as distinguished from ideas.)

And since such knowledge is derived from the sense of seeing, feeling, hearing, smelling, or tasting, it is a sensory cognition, called a sense percept. And such a percept should be taken as more than a mere content of consciousness; it should be taken as pertaining to that which the mind comprehends as a fact of sense; a fact which is not only thought in the cognition, but which also persists after the sensation subsides. It constitutes an object of thought which the intellect may elaborate in the profoundest concepts of reason and knowledge.

Such sensations are more than mere continuances through nerve and brain; they are servient complexes which are resolved in dominant percepts representing in consciousness objects of attention in given situations, with attributes significant of such objects and of their behaviour and relations in the situations of which they are severally parts. And while color, for instance, attributed to an object, is not a presence in such object, it is significant, nevertheless, of both the attributed quality and of the length of the light waves impinging on the retina of the eye; waves reflected by the object of attention in determining its own tonal character.

Sound is external phenomena made intelligible by the sense of hearing. These and other sense complexes are resolved in such terms of understanding as enable the mind to act successfully on matter. And one is conscious of real things in everyday life.

In considering what is real, one is confronted with the fact of material things; and materiality is sufficiently pronounced in the greater number of human experiences to raise the inquiry whether matter is the source of all phenomena.

But the thinking subject, the person, is aware of that of the

self that is not material, and of other respects in which the real is not material.

Recurring to the metaphysician's conception of reality as distinguished from phenomena: In philosophy, substance is the essence or substratum which underlies and is capable of having attributes or causing phenomena, but which in spite of changes in outward manifestations remain the same; it is that in which reality is or exists, as distinguished from its qualities, attributes, and the phenomena by which it is perceived. It is that which is modified but it is not itself a form of mode.

Descartes, a great French thinker of an earlier century, regarded mind and matter as the two substances; concomitant, but without interaction between them except as it came to be thought that it was by divine interposition. In brief, substance, in philosophy, is that which exists in itself.

From Descartes' viewpoint there are two kinds of substance,—mind, thinking substance, inclusive of all mental activity; and matter, inclusive of all material things.

Spinoza considered God and nature one substance—dynamic, infinite, and the ground of its own existence. And that such substance consists of an infinite number of attributes; but is known to us through only two of them: The Attribute of Extension, including in its finite modes all physical things and events; and the Attribute of Thought, including in its finite modes all ideas and mental activities.

II.

The Cosmic Order—It is assumed that the universe is a harmonious system or whole, constituting a cosmic order; the idea

being that phenomena, in their general connections, constitute nature a great whole, moved and animated by internal forces. It is obvious, however, that such whole is composed of various parts; for the objective world presents a plurality of things and forces; and the order of such whole must necessarily depend upon the coöperation of such parts, as in the concepts of natural law.

And since the universe is necessarily a system of dependent parts, each of which is limited as reflected by the laws of its nature; and however far thoughts may follow the regress of their antecedents, their series is conceivable as only finite until attributed to some infinite power transcending the limitations of natural law, such universe cannot be conceived as standing alone, independent of some positive of existence.

And although one cannot symbolize infinity, one can logically posit a primal infinite cause of finite things and forces; and that such finite, inclusive of the universe, is in consequence of, and relative to, a cause determined in itself, and therefore an infinite positive cause, the absolutely Infinite, God.

III.

Phenomenal Activities—Inertia in physics denotes the persistence of a particle or body in any existing state of organization until it is affected by forces external to itself. According to the classical theory, it is the law of the material universe that all bodies are passive and would continue forever at rest or would persevere forever in a uniform rectilinear motion unless disturbed by the action of some extraneous force or forces.

In the chemical state of a thing the energy is disposed as the internal force constituting the organization of the whole; and such entity being quiescent until mechanical work is done upon it, it is, in that respect, a mechanical element.

With respect to bodies, the ancient Greek, Democritus, developing the theory of earlier authors, explained the origin of the world by the motion of an infinite number of invisible and indivisible bodies he called atoms, which, differing from one another in form, position, and arrangement, alternately separated and combined by their motions in infinite space. And that in this way the universe was formed, fortuitously, without the interposition of a First Cause. And notwithstanding any differences between his ideas and the ideas of our moderns, the terms "atom" and "atomic," meaning infinitesimal particles in the building up of grosser bodies from the action and interaction of such particles, have become figures of speech in our language.

But there is another concept as true of nature as "atomism." It is "wholism." For there are essential living wholes that are not explainable according to mechanical origin of the universe. There must be a fullness of the real more than in the atom, a causality adequate to the existence of life in its various modes, as well as mechanism. Democritus admitted the presence of law, but denied design in nature. But nature follows patterns of complexity and utility that suggest design.

IV.

Epistemological Idealism—The doctrine that the world is mind or that which is of the character of mind, and that experiences should be interpreted accordingly.

To illustrate: Locke, in his *Essay Concerning the Human Understanding,* distinguished ideas upon the ground of different qualities; holding that sound, color, taste, are secondary qualities, and that ideas reflecting these secondary qualities are subjective processes only, revealing nothing of the nature of material reality. While ideas of extension, figure, motion, reflect primary qualities revealing directly the nature and constitution of that reality which exists outside the mind, in a material world.

One George Berkeley, an English philosopher, born in Ireland in 1685, and sometimes known as the Bishop of Cloyne, denied that there is any difference between ideas on account of so-called primary and secondary qualities; and he contended that the ideas of so-called primary qualities are as subjective as the others. That, in truth, all ideas are subjective. And that since the subjective element is present in all experience, existence apart from experience is an unwarranted abstraction. And that one does not have, in visual ideas, a revelation of the nature of matter; but merely symbolisms of touch and otherwise whereby one interprets one's sensations and so regulates actions as to promote and protect life.

And while Berkeley is frequently referred to as an outstanding exponent of idealism, many others have entertained the same or similar notions about the world and reality generally.

The German philosopher, Fichte, conceiving that the principle of cognition is complete in itself, held that the primitive condition of intelligence is that the ego shall affirm or be aware of itself; the ego being the "I," the Self, or that of the self that feels, thinks, wills, etc., as distinguished from the bodily organization or its attributes or any other object of thought.

He held that the ego posits itself as the first pure act by which

consciousness comes to be what it is; and that it also posits a non-ego, an opposite; and that these synthesize in the percept or idea. This is the principle of the so-called triadic law; that is, that a thesis encounters the opposition of an antithesis, and that these effect a synthesis, which is neither the one nor the other, but a new creation. And this formula is frequently referred to as the Fichte formula.

Bergson's views—The French philosopher, Henri Bergson, author of *Creative Evolution,* and other books on kindred subjects, held, substantially, that the body is organized for action in subjection to the mind; that impressions passing into the body are stimuli for action, and that the brain function relaying such action furnishes a content which perception picks up for the practical understanding.

And touching the epistemology of his subject, he contrasted "intuition" and "intellect" in divergent processes; but, of course, complementary in the flow of life. And upon consideration of the psychic character of the person, he regarded intuition as the more fundamental, but less articulate than intellect. And that the intellect employs concepts and symbols formed after the manner of solids, concepts rigid and unyielding in their exclusiveness.

Although the classical philosophies have regarded ideas either as the products of movements, or as criteria for the interpretation of movements, Bergson seems to have thought that ideas are but representative of aspects of the real; something of the nature of snapshots of the more conspicuous of passing events, while only intuition can comprehend life as a continuous flow; and that the formats of the intellect do not fully depict the finer and continuous traceries of the real.

To illustrate: Blocks employed by a child in the construction

of a toy house show only the traceries of the solids; and in no sense the idea of continuous flow of substance.

To Bergson, it appeared that a creative vital process is the reality and the moving principle of the individual life, and of the cosmos as a whole.

Theories of Hegel—G. W. F. Hegel, one of the great German philosophers, entertained the idea of an Absolute, as if there were a cosmic mind or spirit, of which all things consist.

Hegel seems to have accepted the Kantian theory that we must accept the world as the rational nature of the self, the understanding, requires us to interpret it. But Kant had supposed that there are things-in-themselves, that of the universe which is inaccessible to knowledge-phenomena being the first elements cognizable in experience. And that we know phenomena in experience according to categories of the understanding, and that such categories are ultimate facts of our intelligence, determining its constiution.

But Hegel regarded his categories of understanding as constitutive of truth. And that there is One world, a world of truth and reason. That there is nothing to know except what the nature of our intelligence requires us to acknowledge. That such is an absolute principle, at the basis of our lives, enabling us to know the truth. And that the world is a world of phenomena to us only as we fail to grasp that principle.

He did not sever the world (universe) as Spinoza did, into extension and thought. But he planted thought at the very base of reality, mental and material, in the spirit or absoluteness of the world, in a primary form which, when developed in the processes of nature, is the "Idea" in consciousness.

Now, this Idea is confronted with the apparent contradictions that the world is also many. But Hegel regarded these concepts

as fragments of understanding, abstracted from the whole; and that their consonance with the universality of truth is shown by the dialectic processes of thought.

The dialectic process is the art of separating a subject into its parts and the testing of an idea or principle by showing all of the consequences, both negative and positive, that it involves. For instance, a general or dogmatic proposition, without critical investigation for any possible contradictions, may seem to be perfectly true. But it is a part of the Hegelian theory, that dogmatic propositions of the understanding, as thesis, should be tested by negative reason, the critical that calls it in question, as the anti-thesis, and that the truth is found in the synthesis of these. This is a very sound principle of reason. And this triadic law is of biological application, also: The planted seed, with its germ of life, is disintegrated by the antithesis of the soil, and the values of these are saved in the synthesis of the new plant.

But the logical premise asserted is still in the field of doubt. There is always a possible contingency in the major premise of thought; and the most that we can say of it is, that we know of no exception to the general law or truth it enunciates. And since we must refer our particular to such generalizations for their verifications, it follows that long accepted principles must be revised when some new fact or facts contradict their theories. And that is true of the philosophy of Hegel, in his conclusion that ultimate truth is manifest in the spirit of the Prussian state; for that spirit has twice, in the present generation, baptized the world in blood.

But he asserted the fact of his Absolute upon the basis of the triadic law: That the mind, as thesis encounters nature, the antithesis, and these effect the synthesis of Spirit; that the log-

ical idea descends into nature, there stirring the consciousness of men; and thus the absolute realizes itself in institutions, and returning upon itself, enriched in that of art, science, religion, history, etc. And that after passing through stages of Oriental, Classical, and German culture, it culminates in the Spirit of the Prussian state.

It seems to be a philosophy of absolute mind, developing in the circumstances of an antithetical nature; but of which the understanding is so complete that the coincidence of reason and reality may be affirmed.

V.

Epistemological Realism—Epistemological realism is the doctrine that there is a world independent of our experience. And it is a more tenable theory of the world than idealism.

It is quite reasonable that the real has determinations of its own, distinguishable classes and kinds of ontologic stature, which, in particulars unified in the stimulus and in the neural and cerebral processes, have significance for the understanding. And though such forces and the mind are not of the same series or kind; yet they are in relation and cohere in the same unit of action in which the mind, the positive, apprehends, in the sense percept, the significance of such relative movements.

And the percept being thought, the concept is in logical relations in the categories of the mind.

But the advocates of such realism do not agree as to the nature and character of these processes.

Among theories advanced are the following:

Naive realism, that the object presented in the perception and the external objct so represented are, by an immediate intuition, known to be one.

Representative realism, such as the copy theory of Locke and others, holds that, at the moment of perception, the perceived object and the real object are numerically and qualitatively two, but connected by an act of inference.

Neo-realism, the new realism, advances the theory that the mind, by selection and analysis, knows the perceived object and the real object to be numerically and qualitatively one.

Critical realism regards the perceived object as a mental state; and that it and the real object are numerically two but connected by an abstract essence, a function the datum of which is more immediate and certain than that of inference.

John Locke, in his *Essay Concerning the Human Understanding,* denied that the mind contains any innate ideas. He regarded the mind as if it were a piece of blank paper, to be written upon by experience. And he traced the source of all ideas to sensation and reflection, as processes by which all knowledge is derived from experience.

David Hume held that the content of mind is embraced within the term "perceptions"; and that perceptions consist of sensory impressions and ideas—ideas being merely faded impressions. And that knowledge is cognition of the relations between such perceptions; but that there is no necessary connection between cause and effect, the idea of cause being due to the habit of mind which expects the event which usually follows another.

Empiricism, though present in some ancient thought, is, in its scientific significance, an essentially modern theory; and has a legitimate field in that application. Francis Bacon taught that

we are to build our knowledge through careful investigation of fact, and was, in that respect, an empiricist.

Many modern theories appeal to experience as the source of knowledge. But a type of empiricism, distinguishable from these, regards mind as a place or support of ideas or a stream of tendencies without presupposition of antecedent unity or constitution of mind. This theory seems wholly inadequate to explain mind as the conservator of knowledge, or the increase of knowledge through intellectual elaboration.

William James advanced what he called a theory of Radical Empiricism, a theory that in addition to the substantive states, there are certain conjunctive relations given directly through experience, equally as real as the substantive states.

VI.

The Critical Philosophy of Immanuel Kant—He developed his philosophy in three Critiques—the *Critique of Pure Reason,* the *Critique of Practical Reason,* and the *Critique of Judgments.* They are related; but the *Critique of Pure Reason* is the principal, and the one we have in mind.

Kant said the purpose of his essay was to determine whether synthetic judgments *a priori* are possible; and he classed judgments as either analytic or synthetic. If the predicate of a judgment belongs to the subject as somewhat contained in the conception of it, it is cogitated through identity, and the judgment is analytic. But those judgments in which such connection is cogitated without identity, are synthetic judgments. The analytic judgment adds nothing in the predicate to the conception of

the subject, but merely analyses it into its constiuent concepts, which are thought already in the subject. But a synthetic judgment adds to the conception of the subject something not contained in it, and which no analysis can discover in it.

He defined knowledge independent of all experience as knowledge *a priori*; the criteria of which are necessity and entire universality, distinguishing it from knowledge derived from experience, which he classed as empirical. And that a proposition containing the idea of necessity in its very inception, or derived from another proposition equally involving the idea of necessity, is absolutely *a priori.*

And a judgment carrying with it absolute and strict universality, admitting of no possible exception, is not derived from experience, and is valid absolutely *a priori.*

Differing from this, an empirical judgment never exhibits strict and absolute universality; although such a judgment may assume a comparative universality (by induction), constituting a premise of thought to which we have not heretofore known of any exception; and be taken as a major premise in general logic and, be *called a priori* as distinguished from purely empirical, knowledge, but such judgments were not within the scope of his inquiry.

He applied the term "transcendental" to all knowledge which is not so much occupied with objects as with the mode of cognition of such objects, so far as the mode is possible *a priori.* But he said such a system would be a transcendental philosophy if it should contain a complete exposition not only of synthetic knowledge *a priori,* but of analytical knowledge *a priori,* also; and would go beyond his purpose. That his purpose was not to carry analysis further than necessary to understand, in their full extent, the principle of synthesis *a priori.* And that since

reason is the faculty that furnishes the principle of knowledge *a priori,* and pure reason the faculty of cognizing anything absolutely *a priori,* he would develop a special science and call it the *Critique of Pure Reason.*

He did not undertake to deal with the nature of outward objects, which is infinite; but solely with the mind, which judges of the nature of objects, and, again, with the mind only in respect of its cognitions *a priori.* And such Critique does not enlarge the bounds of reason; but, rather, purifies the reason by negative restraints, keeping speculative reason in bounds.

In this realm of intelligence he distinguished sensibility, manifested in perceptions accompanied with sensation from intellectual knowledge by conceptions.

In distinguishing the transcendental basis of the two elements of intelligence, he considered perceptive knowledge under the title of Transcendental Aesthetics, and conceptive knowledge under various subdivisions, but principally under that of Transcendental Analytic.

In the Transcendental Aesthetic he held that space and time are transcendental forms of representation that belong to the mind and not to the object apart from being known. And that they are the universal forms under which all percipient experience is acquired. And in the Transcendental Analytic he distinguished Understanding as a faculty of rules and representation, from Reason, as a faculty of principles; and emphasized a distinction between sensibility and understanding.

Difference between Sensibility and Understanding—Touching sensibility, it is part of Kant's theory that the only manner in which our knowledge relates to object immediately is "by means of an intution." That an intuition can take place only in so far as the object is given to us; and this is possible only on the

condition that the object affects the mind in a certain manner. "The capacity for receiving representations (*receptivity*) through the mode in which we are affected by objects, he called *sensibility.*" Thus, objects are given to us by means of sensibility, which alone furnishes intuitions; and they are *thought* by the understanding, giving rise to conceptions.

And intuitions without conceptions are void, and conceptions without intuitions are empty.

According to Kant, all thought must, ultimately, by means of certain signs, relate directly or indirectly to intuitions, and, consequently, to sensibility, because in no other way can an object be given to us. And that the effect of an object upon the faculty of representation is sensation. And that the sort of intuition which relates to an object by means of sensation, he called an empirical intuition, the undetermined object of which he called a phenomenon; and that in the phenomenon which corresponds to the sensation, he called its matter; and that which effects that the content of the phenomenon can be arranged under certain relations, he called its form.

He concluded that the matter of all phenomena is given to us by experience, *a posteriori,* the forms of which lie ready *a priori* for them in the mind, and consequently, can be regarded separately from all sensation. And that this pure form of sensibility is pure intuition entertained by the understanding, which refers it to its object, an empirical intuition, the consciousness of which is perceived representation accompanied with sensation.

That is, that there exists in the mind *a priori,* pure forms of sensuous intuition in general in which all of the manifold (the sum of parts contained in a whole) content of the phenomenal world is arranged and viewed under certain relations called its form.

For example: If we abstract from a body all of that which we think belongs to it, there is still left from the empirical intuition the ideas of extension and shape.

These belong to pure intuition which exists *a priori* in the mind, as mere forms of sensibility, and without any real object in the sense of sensation. However, if we materialize these sense patterns by filling them with this or that kind of thing, we cognize the phenomenon that appears; but, according to Kant, we do not know the sensible thing as a thing-in-itself, but only in phenomena. Experience, according to Kant, is necessary to knowledge, but all knowledge is not derived from experience.

Touching the Understanding, knowledge *a priori* is that which is independent of all experience. And pure knowledge *a priori* is that which has no empirical element mixed up with it.

Kant gives the example: "Every change has a cause."

This is a proposition *a priori,* but *impure,* because change is a conception which can only be derived from experience. But it does state a rule, of which we know of no exception; and, therefore, it is a logical premise of thought, such as the major premise in a syllogism, and such as Comte called positive knowledge.

Kant thought that the data of sense cohere in intelligence; that they are given us through sensibility, and are thought by the understanding; and that the understanding effects such coherence and gives form and structure thereto through the guidance of such formative principles some of which have been mentioned and certain categories of the understanding.

Kant, in defining such categories, seems to have accepted those categories which he observed were in use in the daily judgments of people, and in the sciences. He considered that they are pure concepts of the understanding, and corresponding

with the logical functions of thought in every possible judgment. Such conclusion has been challenged. But such categories are interesting, and are divided into four classes, as follows: Categories of Quantity,—universal, particular, singular. Categories of Quality,—affirmative, negative, infinite. Categories of Relations,—categorical, hypothetical, disjunctive. And Categories of Modality,—problematical, assertorical, apodictical.

(Bergson assigned a more extended meaning to intuition in contrasting it with intellect, and we shall do so in relation to instinct.)

Kant, in explaining the categories, said: "They are conceptions of an object in general, by means of which its intuition is contemplated as determined in relation to one of the logical functions of judgment. The following will make this plain. The function of the categorical judgment is that of the relation of subject to predicate; for example, in the proposition, 'All bodies are divisible.' But in regard to the merely logical use of the understanding, it still remains undetermined to which of these two conceptions belongs the function of subject and to which the function of predicate. For we could also say, 'Some divisible is a body' but the category of substance, when the conception of a body is brought under it, determines that; and its empirical intuition in experience must be contemplated always as subject, and never as predicate. And so with all of the other categories."

And in another place, "The categories serve only to render empirical cognition possible. But this is what we call experience; consequently, in cognition, their applications to objects of experience is the only legitimate use of the categories." Thus the purposes of categories: to render empirical cognition possible; and they are conceptions of an object in general, by means

of which its intuition is determined in relation to one of the logical functions of judgment.

How do they render empirical cognition possible?

He held that to think an object and to cognize an object is not the same thing; that there are two elements in a cognition: first, the conception whereby an object is cogitated (the category), and secondly, the intuition whereby the object is given. But the conception would still be a thought in form, even if no corresponding intuition; but it would not apply to any object of sense. Consequently, our thought of an object, by means of a pure conception of the understanding, can become cognition for us, only in so far as this conception is applied to objects of the senses.

Kant said that "the table of the categories is naturally our guide to the table of principles, because they are nothing else than rules for the objective employment of the former."

Then he gives table of principles, as follows: 1, Axioms of Intuition; 2, Anticipations of Perceptions; 3, Analogies of Experience; and 4, Postulates of Empirical Thought in General.

Sensuous intuition is either pure intuition, as in the representation of time and space, or empirical intuition, of that in time and sense, by means of a sensation, as real.

Now, streams of sensations pouring into consciousness have no organization in their relations to each other, and while they constitute a manifold, the sum of many things, it is necessary for the understanding to organize them in an empirical intuition before they have any meaning; and this process is that of conjunction of the manifold of the intuition. And still, to define a conception of a definite object there must be a synthesis of the unity of apperception. Apperception is coherence of ideas in the

unity of self-consciousness. And thus the categories make empirical intuition possible by the original synthesis of apperception, cogitated in the synthetic unity of apperception in self-consciousness.

Touching the second purpose of the categories, they are conceptions of an object in general, by means of which its intuition is not only determined, but determined in relation to one of the logical functions of judgment.

Therefore, we cannot know sensible things as things-in-themselves, but only as phenomena; and that results in a conditioned universe for us, the universe of phenomena; and the natural laws we know are laws of such phenomena, leaving in the Unconditioned, outside human cognition, things-in-themselves and the laws of the unconditioned, except as eternal principles are exemplified in phenomena.

These pure categories of the understanding are not the same things as the logical categories in the classifications of things and ideas, as understood.

Transcendental logic—Touching transcendental logic, it is not sufficient to meditate upon properties of a figure before you, or on the conception of it in your mind. But you should make transcendental (mental) construction *a priori,* and not attribute any property to the object not given to it by the mind.

Illustrations: The first man who demonstrated the properties of the *isosceles* triangle, found that it was not sufficient to meditate on the figure, as it lay before his eyes, or the conception of it, as it existed in his mind, and thus to discover knowledge of its properties; but that it was necessary to produce these properties, as it were, by a positive *a priori* construction; and that, if he would arrive at *a priori* cognition, he must not attribute to

the object any other properties than those which would necessarily follow from that which he had himself, in accordance with his conception, placed in the object.

This logic is distinguishable from that general logic which is the science of thought and reason, forms of which we shall mention later; general logic analyzes the whole of its conception, but transcendental logic is concerned only with pure thought; and references are made to categorical judgments to illustrate such difference—the reader to apply relevant principles to other forms of judgment.

Touching the transcendental, human reason is a sphere of cognition, and is called upon to consider questions which it cannot decline, as they are presented by its own nature. It begins with principles in the field of experience, the truth and sufficiency of which are assured by experience itself; as in deductions of the laws of phenomena, and in formal logic.

But reason soars according to the laws of its nature, to ever higher and more remote conditions which it cannot explain according to the principles serving it so well in the field of experience. Such is the field of metaphysics.

Now, metaphysics and physics are two theoretical sciences which have to determine their objects *a priori*; metaphysics entirely so, and physics partially so. The theory of the transcendental logic is that the object of the conception is determined by the mind, and that the conception is not determined by the thing in itself, except remotely, as it is represented in the *a priori* intuition.

Now, metaphysics is purely a speculative science, and dealing with conceptions, it is entirely independent of the teachings of experience; and not like mathematics and natural philosophy, with conceptions applied to intuition.

However metaphysical cognition cannot transcend possible experience. Therefore, the transcendental, and consequently, knowledge, are limited to that coming within the possibility of experience. He called ideas transcending the possibility of experience, transcendent ideas, and invalid. But that the mind can think an *object* as a thing-in-itself if it does not depend on an intuition of sense; and that, therein is the basis of moral liberty; that the mind can think the soul, but with no intuition of sense. If the soul were conceivable as a phenomenon, and therefore, within the limits of sensibility, it would lack the liberty which is an essential of morality.

That the natural laws we know are laws of phenomena, valid only for the realm of the conditioned; but there is an unconditioned essential to complete the series of conditions within the domain of phenomenal law; and therefore, metaphysics is limited to the domain of possible experience; for it is merely a science of a subject matter within the domain of the conditioned, the field of sensibility. But the soul, as a thing-in-itself, is not referable to an empirical intuition as the ultimate ground of its being; and therefore not within the limits of Sensibility. And the author might have supported his explanation by the principle of namic philosophy, that activities of the soul through its window of mind and in its moral liberty of spirit import the actor.

Criticisms—Kant approached his subject in terms of faculty psychology, and employed the method of the empirical sciences in severing wholes into separate parts or faculties; engendering the problems of conjoining in conclusions. The *nexus* of the pure and the empirical intuitions in effecting sensibility is rather mechanical; when if he had realized that the principle of transcendentalism is more extensive than as he applied it, and that the positive higher charcter of man effects an entity, the person,

which is inclusive of his entire manifold-physical and cerebral as well as the psychic processes, as one system or piece in nature, and that the cognition of phenomena is of the potential of that entirety, though functioning through specialized facilities, he could have realized that the understanding transcends, but nevertheless involves, as if they were its own, the cerebral functions in sensation, perceiving the phenomenal matter of such sensations. All one simple process in nature. Of course, this does not mean that there are no differentiations of mental processes; but there is one soul having the namicity of mind in understanding and reason.

He concluded that the ideas of God, Freedom, and Immortality are transcendent and not valid conclusions of the speculative reason.

However, in his *Critique of Practical Reason,* Kant concluded that our experience as practical moral beings, recognizing absolute obligation to obey moral law, has implied in it certain presuppositions regarding our natures and the nature of ultimate reality; and that our recognition of the absolute authority of moral law and our obligation to obey it presupposes that we have the power and freedom of will to do so; as moral obligations would have no meaning for an individual whose will is not free. And that moral experience implies a belief in God as the moral governor of the universe, and in immortality as affording an opportunity for the demands of the moral law to be progressively realized.

And it may be said that the moral concept has a content importing spiritual reality transcending sense, and is distinguishable from the mere logical functions of the factual predicates of the empirical sciences and the *a priori* predicates of the physics

and metaphysics. The phenomenal of this spiritual transcendental is conscience, the monitor of the soul, guiding in virtue of a spiritual insight, consonant to that which is the essential of its genesis, a universal spiritual reality.

Man, living in a world of experience, avails himself of both sense and rational intelligence; and he is required to make moral decisions in addition to the judgments making such decisions necessary; and if he had no quality of mind above that afforded to animals by organic life, he would lack that which makes such decisions possible.

CHAPTER THREE

LOGICAL FORMS OF THOUGHT

I.

DEFINITIONS—In logical parlance any class of things may be called a genus, if it be regarded as made up of two or more species, a species being a class which is regarded as forming part of a next higher class. The terms *genus* and *species* are relative to each other, the genus being the higher class, which is divided, and the species being the two or more smaller classes into which the genus is divided. In that respect, iron is a species of the genus metal.

It is necessary to distinguish the logical use of such terms from their employment in natural history. Genus in logical use, means the sum of the qualities common to all of the things within the extension of the concept, and supposed to mark them out from all other classes; and species merely means the sum of the qualities common to all of the individuals forming part of the genus, and sufficient to mark them out from the rest of the genus and from all other species. When a thing is so pecu-

liar and so unlike other things that it cannot easily be brought within a class with others, it is said to be *sui generis*, or of its own genus.

Of these terms, as used in the material sciences, a species is a class of plants or animals supposed to have descended from common ancestors, and to be the narrowest class possessing fixed forms; and a genus is the next higher class. However, under the Darwinian theory of the origin of species and under many of the theories on genetics, the difference of genera and species disappear; for they must, alike, have descended from common ancestors. But such a hypothesis rests upon theories of organic evolution not adequately supported.

A species in logical thought is defined by adding to the genus the difference between it and the species being defined. In the proposition, Man is a mature male person. Man is the species, and *mature male* is the difference. And man is defined by adding the difference *mature male*, to the genus *person*. Therefore, man is a mature male person. Thus the particular is referred to the more general term for explanation as to its more general relations and character, exemplifying the same principle of relation manifest in Induction and Deduction; induction being a method of discovering a more general truth or law; and deduction a method of referring the less general to the more general for explanation.

Other forms of definition consist of enumerations of constituent elements of things being defined, or by describing their attributes.

II.

Recurring to the idea of universals or general notions; the most particular term, iron, followed by the more general term, metal, and that by the most general term, element, give the series: Iron, metal, element. This is called a subaltern series or scale. Iron is a species of its genus metal. Metal is the subaltern genus of iron. And, in turn, it is a species of its genus *element,* which is the summum of greatest genus of the series.

Now, iron is subsumable immediately under metal; but only mediately under element. That is, the relation between iron and element, in the scale, must be mediated through the middle term, metal. That is the principle of the relations of the most particular and the most general in propositions, when the most particular is not subsumable immediately under the most general.

III.

Reasoning From Analogy—Where a proposition true of one thing is considered true of another because of the resemblance of the two, without reference to any greater generalization, the second is considered analogous to the first but such is not proof and is frequently erroneous.

IV.

Induction—Induction is a process of reasoning in the discovery of generalizations, universals constituting general principles, truths, or universal laws.

Induction

There may be a body of phenomena or group of co-ordinate facts reflecting no apparent relations between themselves; and yet proper research and thought may discover some universal law, or general principle, or truth common to them all. Induction is the rational process in the discovery of such common denominators.

In such process careful and critical examination of all relevant facts is or should be made; and after reflection, a preliminary hypothesis or generalization, seemingly explanatory of all the considered facts, is formulated. And with the view of verifying or discrediting such hypothesis, further examinations of all facts and circumstances that may affect the theory of the hypothesis are made. And if any fact or logical inference is discovered inconsistent with or contradictory of such theory, an amendment of the hypothesis or a new one is made, and like reasoning resumed and continued until an induction, or generalization, explanatory of all known facts, is discovered.

Inductions are not demonstrable conclusions. They are more or less contingent, and must be accepted upon the warrant of sufficient reason; for however true such a generalization may seem to be, some new fact or facts, discrediting it, may be discovered later; when like proceedings to discover some more satisfactory explanation must be undertaken.

In the sciences the student or observer does not always wait on the slower processes of nature; but adopts and applies techniques in experimentation and observation with and of representative specimen, and thus hastens the discovery of many laws, or verifies or modifies understanding of accepted ones. Such induction in the discovery of law, together with other general truths, constitute the known in the light of which the previously unknown is found to be what it is.

V.

Deduction—Deduction, in logic is the form of reasoning by which a specific fact or conclusion is derived or inferred from a general law or principle. Thus appears the principle of the reference of a particular to a universal for explanation.

This is formal reasoning; and the statement in propositions, the argument, is called a syllogism, the form of which is associated with the name of Aristotle. Every syllogism must contain three terms,— the major, the middle, and the minor. These correspond, and in the same order, with the three terms in the subaltern series. But in the syllogism they are expressed in propositions; propositions called premises, followed by a conclusion. The synthesis of the premise propositions is effected through the relations of these terms; one example of which is as follows:

Metal is an element,	(Major premise)
Iron is a metal,	(Minor premise)
Therefore, iron is an element,	(Conclusion)

The particular, iron, the subject of the minor propositional premise, is referred to the general truth stated in the major premise; and the minor premise affirming that its subject is of the same quality as metal, bringing the minor premise within the conditions of the major, the conclusion, that iron is an element, necessarily follows. That is, metal being a general notion, taken universally, and distributed in the subject of the major premise whatever is true of it is equally true of any member of the class, taken separately, as shown by this example.

As said, there must be three terms in a syllogism, and no term

can be distributed in the conclusion that is not distributed at least once in the premises.

But no particular form of the statement is required. The minor premise may precede the major, or one premise may be omitted altogether, if it is clearly implied, as, "Air being a material substance, it has weight." This is with reference to the omitted major premise that all material things have weight. An observer may conclude that existing meteorological conditions portend rain or storm. Such is with reference to a general notion or opinion, and its significance, entertained by him.

The foregoing instances are deductions from premises containing three terms, the synthesis of the premises being effected principally through the quality relations of the terms; but when the middle and minor terms differ only in quantity, the minor premise may be a singular proposition, subsumed under a universal one, very much after the form of the subsumption of a particular under a universal general notion. For instance, all Americans should honor the presidents; George Washington was one of such presidents; therefore Americans should honor George Washington.

Such formal logic is the logic of "linear sequence." The whole reason for the conclusion must be found in the premises; that is the conclusion is a synthesis of the premises showing that the minor term is in the relations of the major—that the particular referred to the greater generalization for explanation comes within the law or truth of the latter. But the major premise is an assumption, in so far as any content of the syllogism that may be appealed to. And the most that we can say of it is that it is an impure proposition *a priori,* that is, that we know of no exception to it. And it is taken, in formal logic, as an element of positive knowledge.

VI.

Practical Reasoning—In formal reasoning, the movement is forward from the premises to the conclusion; and the premises must contain the whole reason for the conclusion. But in practical reasoning, reasoning from evidentiary facts as factual premises to some ultimate fact or conclusion, the ultimate fact is itself part of the reason by which it is proved; and the judgment refers back to the evidentiary premise for the purpose of justifying the explanation of the ultimate fact.

We do not employ here the term "proof" in its strict logical sense, but as meaning considerations raising such probability of truth as warrant a conclusion or judgment.

In a trial in court of an action depending upon circumstantial evidence, the trier of the facts, whether judge or juror, should determine the probative value, if any, of every proven relevant circumstance. Such is a deductive process; for the trier, either consciously or unconsciously, refers the circumstance proved, as if it were a minor premise, to his understanding of the involved subject or to opinion derived from some experience, as if to a major premise, in concluding the weight he will give it. The conclusion may be thought without reflection, but any analysis of the process discloses the mentioned elements of the syllogism.

Now, none of the separate circumstances may, though proven, be of any probative value when weighed singly; but when all are considered together, their cumulative force may very satisfactorily establish some ultimate fact. That is, the several separate evidentiary facts may find a unity in an ultimate fact or thesis so essential to the explanation of the whole situation that it is part of the reason by which it is proved, the factual premise

and the ultimate finding constituting a symmetry of thought warranting the latter a satisfactory judgment.

And a speaker in discourse will probably divide his subject into two or more points, to present more clearly the probative value of the respective classes of facts; and then, by the cumulative force of all, seek to establish or discredit the thesis under consideration.

There are cases in which the evidentiary facts bring the problem within the scope of some general principle or principles that are persuasive of, or necessitate, some particular finding.

In the early part of the last century, John Dalton called attention to the chemical law that when substances combine chemically, they do so in certain distinct proportions. But such law did not explain its causal ground; presenting, instead, a case in which a deeper metaphysical adventure, beyond the more obvious laws of phenomena, was necessary to discover some underlying unity of the sciences themselves.

The evidentiary facts brought the problem within the scope of the principle that every effect must have a cause; and they concluded, as an ultimate fact, that matter is composed of ultramicroscopical particles, atoms, separated by space either entirely destitute of mass or at best consisting of mass in a very attenuated state, and having affinities determining combinations in the uniformities reflected by such law. Such ultimate fact furnishes part of the reason by which it is proved.

And in virtue of its implication of universality, it is an induction also.

Such induction was so well supported by the facts then known that it was thought to be an ultimate law, and it became the working hypothesis of all of the physical sciences. It was then supposed that the atom is indestructible; but later ideas touching

the electrical constitution of matter, and recent experience in nuclear physics have changed that conception. But it must be accorded the character of a chemical unit.

VII.

Pragmatic Philosophy—The Pragmatic philosophy, notwithstanding its deficiencies, has contributed much on the theory of values to the understanding of psychology, logic, teleology, and religion.

Pragmatism, in its logical references, treats of certain fundamental concepts, such as "truth," "error," "fact," "reality," etc. And it is the opinion of pragmatists that "truth" can not be defined as the agreement or correspondence of thought with reality. But they think of truth in terms of values. That is, that truth is followed by practical consequences—values in results. As it has been phrased, "That which works is true." And it is regarded that truth in that respect is connected with the good; that is, good for something.

A. C. Pierce, William James, and John Dewey were prominent in advancing theories of pragmatism.

It seems to be a principle or formula of the pragmatic philosophy, as a method of clarifying metaphysical thought, that the conception of the conceivable effects conceivably having practical bearings, of the object of a conception, should be taken as the whole conception of such object; and that it is only such value that is significant.

That is, the doctrine that the whole meaning of a conception expresses itself in practical consequences; and that a concept has the value of an end consequence in a concrete situation.

Professor John Dewey seems to have regarded ideas as tools

or instruments to be invoked to meet particular needs or crises in concrete situations. And that pragmatism does not aim at truth, generally; but that its business is to discover in concrete situations the best means of the realization of practical ends that life needs.

But while the pragmatic methodology is highly valuable in the interest of truth, there are situations involving human life, and many other aspects of nature as well, that a more fundamental solution is necessary to the meaning of the conception, and its laws. The pragmatic methodology is too narrow for the whole field of thought.

The ethical affinities of pragmatism spring from the perception that all knowing is referred to a purpose, rendering it useful, a means to an end, a good. But such is a cognizable good, conceivable as good for something, and not identical with moral good springing from the moral urge. However, the two are clearly related in the concept of teleological good, teleology meaning end or purpose, moral or only useful.

But teleology has a broader meaning. And as applied to the world, it is a manner of explanation of the tendency of the world, or parts of it, to effect ends or purposes as if in consequence of the guidance of some existing intelligence. And there is that inevitability in nature that meets the requirements of truth, without human appraisal of phenomena.

And such remains true, whatever opinion one may derive from concrete circumstances.

Touching religion, some of the advocates of pragmatism attribute the faith attitude in religion to the "will to believe." And that to him who takes the first step and "wills to believe," an encouraging amount of verification accrues. William James contributed largely to that idea.

CHAPTER FOUR

CERTAIN PHILOSOPHIES AND RELIGION

I.

TOUCHING STATES OF KNOWLEDGE—Auguste Comte, a French philosopher, writing in the Eighteenth Century, A. D., proposed a law of three states of knowledge; designating them the theological, the metaphysical, and the positive. And he held that a branch of knowledge is in the theological state when it supposes the phenomena under consideration to be due to immediate volition, either in the object or in some supernatural being; and in the metaphysical state when for volition is substituted abstract force residing in the object, but existing independently of the phenomena manifesting it; and in the positive state when inherent and external volition, and inherent forces or abstractions personified are absent from the mind, and the explanation of a phenomenon means a reference of it, by way of succession or resemblance, to some other phenomenon, to some more general fact.

This positive knowledge is deductive and scientific, as distinguished from metaphysical speculation and tradition.

There is in this field a legitimate place for metaphysical knowledge supported by metaphysical first principles,—the laws, causes, and elements basic in and explanatory of phenomena.

But it is sometimes seen that a fundamental concept is taken as a major premise of thought comprehensive of more than data pertaining to the ultimate nature and relations of such concept, and thus leading to unsound speculation.

And, again, cosmological assumptions are made that disparage fields of knowledge not coming within their premise; this usually upon the hypothesis that the essence of particulars are to be found only in universals. And something of the kind is seen in Spinozaism, Brahmanism, Neo-Platonism, Christian Science teachings of Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy, and many of the theosophies.

Such metaphysical approaches to knowledge forestall full inquiry, in many instances, by laying down conceptions within which empirical and positive knowledge must be abbreviated to sustain any logical semblance of unity.

Some philosophies rest upon abstract conceptions of this or that as fundamental to reality which are so far removed from critical evaluation that they can justify no more than fleeting opinions.

Contrasted with this is the general or positive approach to knowledge, well illustrated by the categories of Aristotle, a Greek philosopher of the Third Century, B. C., who was one of the great thinkers of all time. He was the first to classify his philosophies, the first of which, his theoretical philosophy, was by one of his later editors placed after his physics, and came to be called metaphysics; but Aristotle never used that name.

His other writings were on Logic, Mathematics, Physics, Ethics,

Politics, Art, etc. And the range of his thinking is well indicated by his several categories, ten in number, namely: Substance, quality, quantity, relation, where, when, position, possession, action, passion.

He regarded substance, the essence of all things, as the universal; and that the other categories are inclusive of properties and accidents.

Porphyry, who wrote a treatise on the logic of Aristotle, reduced the categories to five in number:—Genus, species, property, difference, accident. These are called predicables, and they state every element necessary in a logical definition, or predicated of its subject in a judgment.

Touching in another way the subject of thought are the principles of Linear sequence and Namic transcendency.

II.

Linear Sequence and Namic Transcendency—"Linear sequences" is the principle of sequences, in series, of a force or forces producing them; and frequently manifesting inevitability in the operations of natural laws.

But each of the several sciences treats of segments of nature having laws peculiar to the one, or only a few, of such sciences: Physics treating of physical laws; chemistry, of chemical laws; biology, of biological laws; psychology, of psychic laws. And man, an epitome of nature, reflecting all these, and having the powers of mind and the moral liberty of spirit.

So inquiry must go beyond such phenomena to discover the

basis of their unities. And such are found in namic relations reflecting that other principle, the principle of namic transcendency, in the sense of productive effects of transcending forces operating in or with respect to things, species, organs, functions, etc. And in some instances, the idea of creation as implicit in such concept.

There is a potential of species, as if in anticipation of the forms that actualize specific kinds; and when any such potency is realized through propagation or otherwise, the forms produced follow as sequences in the series of the species to which they belong. And thus a relation of the principle of namic transcendency in the more primal circumstance in the becoming of a living thing, and the principle of linear sequence reflecting the observable phenomena.

But this metaphysical conception of the nexus or relation of an emanation to its source furnishes no adequate analogy for the explanation of the primal inception of the series.

Such inception must be referred to a transcending primal cause, the eternal principles of which underlie and determine the phenomenal secondary causes in nature; for the universe is not a haphazard aggregate, but a system of things and laws constituting a unified whole.

But such is a Conditioned Whole, the phenomena and laws of which are inviolate; and it requires a higher application of the principle of "Namic Transcendency," and that to an Essential of the sum of such conditions, and necessarily transcending the limitations of such conditions. Therefore, God.

Following are mentions of philosophies based on fundamental concepts less comprehensive than the idea of creation or, if allowing an infinite power, treating it as merely introductory to a more limited metaphysical system.

Heraclitus, a distinguished Greek philosopher of the Fifth Century, B. C., accepted the Ionians' ideas of the unity of nature but denied the theory of *being* held by them.

The Ionians sought to explain the material universe in terms of force, energy, movement, etc., as these phenomena are perceived in sensory experience. The Ionians disagreed with the Eleatics and Pythagorians, who explained knowledge and existence in metaphysical terms.

Many thinkers before Heraclitus had sought to find a material substance of which all things consist. But Heraclitus concluded that all things are a flux, and explainable only in terms of energy, movement, force, etc. That is, that change is the sole reality—all things becoming but appearing to remain the same. And that such is the reason or *Logos* of the universe.

The Eleatics opposed the theories of Heraclitus about change, as well as the physical theories of the Ionians; the Eleatics holding that the true explanation of existence is that of a universal unity; a unity which the sense cannot cognize, but which thought, passing over the false representations of sense, can realize all things as One. And that since something cannot be created from nothing, there could not have been a creation.

The Ionians sought to explain the universe in terms of force, energy, and movement; the subject matter of empirical knowledge, as if such concepts were fundamental. But Heraclitus, seeing that such explanation was insufficient, posited, as a condition of their unity, a *logos* or *reason* of the universe.

The Eleatics, not understanding that something may be created from nothing, concluded that the real is All One.

Spinoza is the most outstanding modern who has attempted to resolve the enigma upon premises approximating the like.

Touching the idea of creation, we can have no human under-

standing whether the world (Universe) is eternal or was created in time. But the disparity between the character of things determined in a universe of being and conditions essential to such determinations is persuasive that the idea of creation is valid in the respect that the finite are determined by a namicity, the issue of a causality transcending the limitations of phenomena.

The term "creation" may be taken as signifying the production of the universe in time, or a relation of God and his universe in the eternal order of being in that the ground of this finite is to be found in the infinite.

III.

Immanent Reason in the World—The idea of immanent reason in the world is of ancient origin; and may be found in Egyptian, Indian, Persian, and other thought; but probably reaching its most definite formulation in the Greek Doctrine of the Logos.

This term derived from the Greek equivalent signifying speech or to speak. And language being a characteristic of man, a reasoning being, the term came to mean reason. And the Greeks, conceiving that the world is an orderly whole, thought of it as a product of reason, and as governed by the same principle.

The doctrine of the Logos arose in physical speculation, as is seen in the reference to Heraclitus; and later passed into ethics and theology. It was pronounced in the philosophy of the Stoics, who predicated an active principle pervading and determining the world. But such operating principle was conceived by them as material, and was used equally of nature and of God, as a metaphysical concept aiding them in understanding physical phenomena, as well as suggesting Stoical virtues. The Stoics,

like Spinoza, were pantheists; but they approached the subject from a different viewpoint.

Such Greek term is translated in the Prologue of the Gospel of John in our Bible, as meaning "Word"; but the Greeks used it in its metaphysical significance; while it appears, in the gospel, to connote the divine person and activity with whom Jesus was identified.

IV.

Theories of Spinoza—Spinoza, a distinguished philosopher of the Seventeenth Century, a resident of Holland, and of Jewish ancestry, concluded that God and nature are one, constituting reality which he called substance; and that such substance is dynamic, the ground of its own Being, infinite, and self-sustaining. That it consists of an infinite number of attributes, and absolutely infinite in that it is complete. Thus a special theory of the world, and its logic, "linear sequence."

At the time Spinoza wrote it was generally thought that mathematics was the most perfect science; an opinion which Spinoza shared, and which much influenced his thinking.

It is part of the theory of Spinoza that while this absolute infinite substance consists of an infinite number of "Attributes," it is known to us through only two of them: The Attribute of Extension and the Attribute of Knowledge. That such Attributes do not belong to, but are identical with, the substance; and that each is an ultimate factor of its kind; that is, a quality, energy, or character, infinite of its kind of reality, determining results according to its own laws. That such Attributes are concurrent in action, and that each manifests finite modes or modi-

fied states of its respective kind of reality; that is, that all physical objects and events are modes of Extension, and that all ideas and mental activities are finite modes of Thought.

The term substance is usually contrasted with its qualities called Attributes, of which it is, theoretically, the bearer. But Spinoza did not use the term with that meaning. By substance he meant the whole of reality as a system of attributes identical with such substance, except that the Attributes are only of the several kinds of the real manifested in their respective modes. The theory seems to regard reality, in its ultimate character, as a quantity or energy manifested in some modes as physical, and in others as mental. And these modes may be considered from the viewpoint of the positive sciences. Such sciences are only departments of knowledge treating of phenomena and their laws, and the relations of concepts representing the same.

And since such laws are empirical, that is, are derived from experience, such sciences are only co-extensive with the departments of knowledge to which they respectively pertain.

But reason goes beyond that, to inquire into the more fundamental unities in nature which are not phenomenally obvious; and inquires into the more fundamental unities of the sciences themselves. Such is the field of metaphysics. It was in that field that Spinoza expended a great learning in developing his theories of life and of the real. He was excluded by the Synagogue from the community of Jews, because of his heterodoxy, although he was in fact a deeply religious man.

Harking back to Greek thought, that there is a substance or substratum of the real, it was easy to think of such substance as material. The other extreme found expression in Plato, who hypostatized abstract thought in the theory that the valid universal idea is the Archetype of the real—a kind of notional en-

tity; and that particular things are real to the extent they participate in such ideas or class names.

Spinoza did not use the terms "substance" and "attributes" in the Platonic sense, nor in the sense of medieval rationalism.

Particular things are characterized by qualities and quantities. And the sum of such attributes is called the intension of the particular, and the number of such particulars coming within the same class of many are the quantity or extension of the concept of such class. As when in the unity of consciousness it is apperceived that a number of different things or forces have attributes in common, these are abstracted from the dissimilar characteristics of such things or forces, and synthesized in a concept of a class or kind, leaving the dissimilar qualities unnoticed. And the number of things or forces so included, are the logical quantity or extension of such concept.

Now, Spinoza used the terms "Substance" and "Attributes" as meaning more than such abstract universal concepts, logically extended. He meant substantive reality as constrasted with such abstractions. Spinoza's idea of nature was that of an active self-determining process that is both nature and God. Not that this Divine Nature transcends the cosmic, but that there is but one substance, one absolutely independent being, determined in itself through the necessity of its own nature, and inclusive of all things—every thing following from the existence and nature of God.

That God does not have emotions; nor does He act as man acts by entertaining plans and then acting upon them; nor is He transcendent or apart from nature. Nature is God.

According to pure logical sequence, the finite modes are effects of the so-called One substance; but such idea would have exposed their disparity and required Him to attribute to the One

substance a transcending, creative stature. But by the interposition of the arbitrary Spinozian Attributes, the effects of One substance are seemingly diffused into the finite modes.

The Attributes are treated as emanations of the same substance, differentiated in respect of the several, separate, finite modes, which emanate from them. And thus nature is explained without cognizance of the principle of namic transcendency.

Now, we may take "extension" and "thought" as denoting fundamental substances, because they are also logical categories, connoting the ultimate properties of the things falling within such categories, respectively. That is because each of the particulars is allowed a reality or essence of its own, including the common properties bringing it within its respective category. But Spinoza did not allow this; he treated the terms of the particulars as connoting only the modes of their more universal Attribute, in that the essences of such particulars were to be found only in the Attributes; and since such particulars do not denote reality, the real is merged in the metaphysical conception of the Attributes.

And by thus sublimating nature he sought to show that it was that congruous with spirit that nature and God are One, connoted by the term "substance."

The two substances, Extension and Thought, are incongruous except upon the hypothesis of thought extension transcending in the ensemble of nature.

V.

Eastern or Hindu Philosophy—The discipline, "Epistemology," or theory of knowledge, strictly construed, excludes "Metaphys-

ics." But they are sometimes so closely related in a subject that epistemology is considered a part of or an introduction to metaphysics. And such relation is seen in certain Eastern or Hindu Philosophy. In the philosophy of the Vedanta school, based largely upon the Vedas, the sacred Sanskrit writing of the ancient Hindu, and upon the Upanishad, a treatise or commentary on Sanskrit literature, reality is denoted by the name "Brahma." Brahma is the One, without quality or relation; for he is All, and can have no relation. But *maya,* illusion, makes Brahma to appear as many. And while it is impossible to define Brahma, yet, on account of his maya aspect, he may be spoken of as creator, sustainer, or destroyer of the universe. But such and the apparent pluralities in nature are false; and they appear as many only so long as avidya, ignorance, continues; for with the avail of true knowledge, which comes with certain other proceedings by which one is absorbed in a universal soul, such plurality of things disappears. That is, the idea of the many derives from empirical knowledge and is untrue, while the metaphysical knowledge, conceiving *all as one,* is true.

And the illusion of falsity of empirical knowledge is due to the transference of things and relations of the objective world to the inner soul.

VI.

Neo-Platonism—Neo-Platonism was the doctrine of the school of Ammonius Saccas and Plotinus, at Alexandria, which flourished from the Third to the Fifth Century of the Christian era. It mixed some of the tenets of ancient Platonists with other prin-

ciples drawn from various sources, particularly from the theosophy of the east. It was the philosophy making the last great stand of the pagans against Christianity.

It posited a First or Primeval Being or Good as the Godhead from which the world emanated by an eternal, timeless, and necessary process, without diminution of the source. And the world being an effulgence or overflowing of the primeval Being, it was considered more or less perfect; and that each degree of emanation had for its principle the totality of being. But that there was a difference between emanations, depending on remoteness from the primal source. That the primal Being or Good first gave fourth *nous*, a high Intelligence having to do with the Platonic ideas. The *nous* was a perfect image of, but of a lower order than, the primal Being; but nevertheless the archetype of all existing things, and giving rise to a world soul. That the soul was, as was the *nous*, immaterial, and standing between the *nous* and the phenomenal world; illumined by the *nous*, and in contact with the world.

And such soul could continue in unity with the *nous*, or it could unite with the phenomenal world and suffer disintegration; subject, however, to a given method of return to the *nous*. And that the *nous* was the source of all other emanations.

Such mysticism embraces a broad range of thought, but the foregoing skeleton of it gives the general idea.

VII.

Some classical Philosophies—The late Bernard Bosenquet, of Great Britain, conceived that the universe is of the nature of a concrete universal; not a thing subsumed under its genus, but

a particular in itself, consisting of the whole of the real; nature and mind together, organized in relations. That nature is a physical fact, outside us, but not real apart from our minds; that thought has the function of organizing worlds of experience; and that the universe in its concreteness is the one true Individual.

The fundamental concept employed by Leibnitz, a philosopher of the last century, was that of "Monads"; that the universe is composed of individual monads, or indivisible centers of force. And touching their ultimate natures and relations, he concluded that they are not extended, nor directly interrelated; but are self-sufficient, always active; and that through a harmony between them produced by God, they form groups of compounds or extended bodies. From such premise, Leibnitz developed a philosophy that receives much attention to this day.

R. H. Holtz, another German thinker of note, was of the opinion that the monads get their significance from the fact that they are in relations; and that self-consciousness is the highest grade of that relation. And it was his opinion, that while mechanism is universal in extent, it is negligible in importance. Certain thinkers called objective idealists, among whom were J. G. Herder and F. W. J. Schelling, German, of the last century, entertained the general notion that the universe, which made our minds, is itself a Great Mind or the work of a Great Mind. And Schelling thought that there is life, reason and purpose in nature; and that nature is visible Spirit, and that Spirit is invisible nature. And that the absolute or perfect cosmic Spirit unfolds itself in both.

Arthur Schopenhauer, a German philosopher of the last century, opposed the ideas of Hegel. He thought of the world as "Will" and "Idea." And that every body, inorganic and organic, is more or less a manifestation of the objectification of the will

to live. That such will to live fashions an intelligence in man manifested in his perceptions and in his body as a perceived thing; and in his yearning and striving.

The great Scotch thinker, Sir William Hamilton, held that to think is to condition; that man's thinking powers are not absolute or infinite, but are limited. But since thought proposes ideas of the unlimited, there is room for faith concerning them.

Borden B. Bowne, American, late instructor in Boston University, and the author and editor of various publications, was a personal idealist. He maintained that whether we consider the world as an object of knowledge or as a working of causes and effects, we are forced to the view that it is personalistic, rather than impersonalistic.

E. Eucken, of the University of Jena, held that the course of human history and the various achievements of mankind reveal the presence and interaction of a Spiritual life; and that we find solutions of some things only in a Spiritual life.

VIII.

Materialism—There is a theory that God is identical with the ultimate principle of things. That is but another way of stating the monistic metaphysical principle that all phenomena are traceable to one agent, the unity of substance.

The proposition is equivocal. If it be construed as pertaining to the mechanical, it leads to a materialistic philosophy. And if such principle be regarded as a living, infinite Power, it leads to a spiritual interpretation of the real, in its ultimate significance.

Materialism is a philosophy which teaches that every thing

which exists is ultimately material in nature, or can be explained by the laws of material phenomena. It takes matter as existing, and regards all transformations or mutations of matter as effects or emanations of the one material substance. The theories of such materialisms are that matter is dead, and its processes mechanical, leaving no room for psychic character; and that its governing laws are expressions of blind necessities.

However, such theory is so wholly inadequate to the explanation of life, that a kind of hylozoism is allowed by some as a part of the same substantial character. Hylozoism is the doctrine that life and matter are inseparable. Materialism does not allow that this condition of life ever escapes the mechanical limitations, or comes to a significance of its own in any separable or definite principle, but holds that mental states are built up of different elements in like manner as the body is built up of different parts. And that the creature and all of its capacities are ultimately resolvable into physical, mechanical forces and substance. That is, that mechanical principles are sufficient to generate the initiative from lower to higher forms of being.

There is current an idea of emergent evolution, holding substantially, that the world emerged through three levels,—matter, life, mind; and that as a higher level acquired new characteristics, the lower ones became dependent on it; and, consequently, a progression upward. But the initiation of the involved factors are not properly accounted for. The explanation is purely mechanical; matter is taken as containing in itself, and in diversities of series consonant to the principle of linear sequence, all that unfolds in the higher emergents; or that matter contained the elements which, escaping from its mechanism, coalesced in patterns of life and mind; that is, that the monera of Haeckel con-

tain the principle of total being, and that the highest emerged from the putridity of the lowest.

But these factors do not escape the question, Whence came they?

The law of biogenesis and all experience show that vital properties are derived only from pre-existing living things; and that the vital constitution of the organism is its substance, particular to its kind of reality; and that it is not an emanation from material antecedents, but a creation. And in the ascending scale of life, there is an increase of values for which there is no assignable Causality except infinite values, whence the determinations of nature manifesting phenomena subject to law.

The positive sciences confirm this interpretation of the real, in that they find that phenomena of different species or kind, are governed by different laws, marking many respects in which they differ.

There are therefore two intrinsic forces in nature; the vital and the mechanical; and touching the respective offices of these, the vital lifts the entity to a level in the hierarchy of laws that its mechanisms are stabilized in the character of one of the species; and the creature, thenceforth adapted to its environment in that form, propagates its kind.

There is something of a transcendental logic with respect to the background of the foregoing situations of the real; a logic which is more than the transcendental in the construction *a priori* of pure forms of thought. That is, a logic or the idea of creation in the inception and becoming of that which then conforms to the principle of *linear sequence.*

The pattern of creation is manifest in the positive of life effectively involving matter in the triadic process of creating an or-

ganism; and though such phenomena are in the line of *linear sequence* in a process of natural law, and well within the purview of discursive thought. The interminable regression of such conditioned entity or of its series, independently of infinite power in its inception or in the inception or its series or limited antecedents, is unthinkable.

IX.

Religion—The Absolute Infinite Power is not to be identified with the cosmic nature considered by Spinoza; nor to be brought within the limitations of concepts representing phenomena, or metaphysical speculations; nor the concept to be so emptied of reality that it is a mere idea. And while speculative thought can ascribe only attributes and the condition of existence to God; yet the human soul is, in the infinity of God, destined to realizations lighted by ethical and spiritual truths.

Our Bible tells the story of the ancient Hebrews, including narratives of the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the latter of whom and whose descendants were also called Israel. And the beginning with them of the Hebrew religious movement, in faith and obedience to law rather than to some philosophy confounding God and nature.

Matthew Arnold says, in his *Literature and Dogma*: "The real germ of religious consciousness * * * out of which sprang Israel's notion of God, to which the record of his history adapted itself, and which came to be clothed upon in time with a mighty growth of poetics and traditions, was a consciousness of a *power not ourselves which makes for righteousness.*" And again, "God was

to Israel neither an assumption nor a metaphysical idea; He was a power that can be verified as much as the power of fire to burn or of bread to nourish; the *power not ourselves that makes for righteousness.*" (Emphasis ours.)

Our Bible, speaking more specifically of the Hebrew faith, tells us that the patriarch, Abraham, though of a polytheistic generation, believed that there is one true God. That God told him to go forth into a country that would be shown to him and God would make of him a great nation, and that in him all families of the earth should be blessed. That he believed God's promises that his seed should be many, and it was counted to him for righteousness.

Such was a great purpose of God; and no less a purpose of Abraham, to which he committed himself; and he was called the Friend of God.

This identification of righteousness with faith and purpose was the beginning of a course of spiritual development that continues to this day, and to which the Christian persuasion is heir. It is not necessary to suppose that God spoke audibly to Abraham, but in inspiration moving him in the confidence of faith.

In the book of Hebrews, our Bible, this faith of Abraham is idealized as follows: "By faith, Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise: for he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." Hebrews 11:8-10.

Many were the great pronouncements of the savants of Israel; among which are the following:

"There is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." Job 32:8.

The prophet Isaiah, referring to the Lord, said:

"Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee: because he trusteth in thee." Isaiah 26:3.

And by others:

"The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes." Psalms 19:7, 8.

"Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. But his delight is in the law of the Lord; and in his law doth he meditate day and night." Psalms 1:1, 2.

"The fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding." Job 28:28.

"Treasures of wickedness profit nothing: but righteousness delivereth from death." Proverbs 10:2.

"The righteousness of the perfect shall direct his way: but the wicked shall fall by his own wickedness." Proverbs 11:5.

"As righteousness tendeth to life: so he that pursueth evil pursueth it to his own death." Proverbs 11:19.

"Righteousness keepeth him that is upright in the way: but wickedness overthroweth the sinner." Proverbs 13:6.

"Righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people." Proverbs 14:34.

St. Paul, in his several letters, extolled this faith of Abraham, and said in addition, Ephesians 2:8, "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is gift of God." And thus is affirmed a stature of spiritual life that is of God.

The most outstanding reality of all experience is the moral

imperative of the human soul, legislating with respect to right and wrong, whether one likes it or not; enacting laws which one cannot violate without suffering the judgment of one's own conscience.

And any plotting of the real must take account of the concepts of right and wrong; and of the person, and the freedom of will to pursue ideals of sympathy, integrity, honesty, duty, and other virtues—all in the light of a conscience excusing one as worthy or else accusing one as unworthy with respect to one's motives, thoughts, and conduct; revealing a spirit state of life from which one cannot escape except by spiritual death.

This relation of man with God is one of dependence. It is not by observation, as in the conjunction of phenomena or phenomenal events; but it is thought in faith, and realized in newness of life.

Note: Touching further details, Extension in its Mechanical Aspects is next considered, including observations about mechanism in general, energetics, conservation of energy, heat, physico-chemical forces, and other phenomena devoid of life, exemplifying the principle of mechanical equivalence.

Next, Vitality and Biological Extension; such as the vitality and life functions of living things, and the specialized extension of matter accommodated to the unamic constitution of the organism, exemplifying the principle of "namic transcendency."

And, further, the differentiation of psychic characters in the ascending scale of life, theories of mind, psychology, intuition, evolution, and certain aspects of religion; and submitting that the self-hood of the person is the substratum underlying and producing the phenomena called "thought," through mind, the capacity assigned that division of labor.

CHAPTER FIVE

EXTENSION IN ITS MECHANICAL ASPECTS

I.

MECHANISM IN ITS GENERAL SIGNIFICANCE—Mechanism in its general significance means the relations of substances to each other in such a way that they vary in such relationships according to invariable laws; and that phenomena are explainable according to the general laws of matter in motion; the idea being that bodies are resolvable into their simplest elements and that their only qualities are due to the uniform laws of connection and interaction between them.

Such theory is consistent with the atomic and electrical theories, and justifies the conclusion that energy and matter are rudimentary, in the mechanical process; but it does not explain the phenomena of life.

II.

Energetics—Energetics is the science in physics, chemistry, and mechanics that treats of material energy. Such energy may be

defined as that attribute of a body or material system by virtue of which the body or system can do mechanical work by changing its shape, position, configuration, or chemical or physical state—mechanical work being defined by same as overcoming resistance through distance, though some contend that forces can operate only through a medium.

According to physical theories, energies of different types such as physical, chemical, electrical, and other energies, are intrinsically the same throughout their various transformation, differing only in respect of different structures and other effective circumstances. And that each such type of energy may be transformed into other types of which it is susceptible. However, it is a principle of nature that energy in an organized state persists in that orientation until it is influenced or acted upon by countervailing force.

III.

Conservation of Energy—The physical law known as the conservation of energy asserts that the total amount of energy in an isolated system is invariable in amount; and that the total amount of any natural system is a quantity which can neither be increased nor diminished by any action between the parts of the system, though it may be transformed into any of the forms of energy of which it is susceptible. This is also the first law of Thermodynamics.

But when a system is not isolated or closed, but open to the influence of external forces, energy may be added from without by such forces; and for the same reason may be subtracted therefrom.

Physical states exhibit a maximum of entropy; the condition

tending to disorganize higher systems, and the consequent resulting, or formation, of lower ones. In the elevation of a weight, the resulting energy system is in a state of stress, gravity pulling in its maximum force against the position of the weight. The weight is said to have potential energy, the energy of position; but it is only an inverse factor in the mechanical system. The momentum of a moving ball is resisted by gravity, atmospheric and other conditions until, if not otherwise arrested, it describes a declining curve, bringing it to rest.

We speak of energy. Is energy in the moving ball anything different from the momentum of the ball? What is energy?

We cannot disassociate it from mass. When oxygen and hydrogen combine to form water, the new substance is distinguishable by new properties; it is a different thing. The chemical reaction effects a transformation of the masses.

IV.

Heat Energy—It is asserted by the second law of thermodynamics that heat tends to pass from a hot body to a colder one; and that such change in the state of energy tends to disorganize and diffuse it. It is said that practically all mechanical energy may be transformed into heat energy; but that such is not true in the transformation of heat into mechanical energy. From this it would seem to follow that a stoker must put more coal energy into a furnace than can be delivered organized to the work. The better formulation is to regard the coal, the furnace, and all conditioning circumstances as an energy system suffering that measure of disorganization which we have called entropy.

Regarding entropy as the quantity or measure of the disorganization of system, the term may be applied to the unavailable energy in any system, the loss of energy in transmission from one system to another, and in the breaking down of unstable systems. These latter phenomena are seen in the radio-active substances. Such system reveals the transformations of matter through successive downward stages, the matter existing in the form of each stage for a short time before breaking down further into newer forms; and such processes are spontaneous. The late experience with atomic bombs and the increased knowledge of nuclear energy are enlightening along these lines. The bomb shows what powerful concentration of energy may be stabilized, for a time at least, in a small body.

Many have expressed serious thought about the radiation of heat from the sun, thinking that such radiation into space marks an increase of entropy which may ultimately cause the death of the universe; while others think that there are possible sources of supply replenishing such loss.

V.

Physico-Chemical Forces—Chemistry is the science which deals with composition and transformation of matter. And matter, however organized, is resolvable into parts called chemical elements. It is chemical theory that every such element has a definite, combining weight, and that combining numbers may be assigned it. That such elements are composed of atoms, and that compounds are formed by the union of atoms of different elements in simple numerical relation. And that when two elements combine in more than one proportion, multiples of the

combining numbers appears; that is, that they combine in multiple proportions.

Atoms may be regarded as the ultimate chemical units, notwithstanding the electronic theory of matter that atoms are composed of protons, neutrons, and electrons. And there is a molecular theory advanced by physicists, that, however homogeneous matter may appear to be, it is really an aggregate of ultra microscopical particles called molecules; the smallest parts into which the substance can be conceived to be divided without changing its chemical character. Atoms may be regarded as the constituents or proximate constituents through whose combinations such molecules are formed, and that the molecules build up grosser bodies.

It is the electrical theory of matter that the nuclei of atoms are composed of protons consisting of positive charges of electricity or corpuscles carrying such charges, and neutrons; and that electrons consisting of negative charges or corpuscles carrying such charges, move in the outer areas of the atoms, after the manner of planets about their central orbs; and that all such charges maintain their respective characteristics throughout every change an atom undergoes. Some scientists disregard this planetary structure, but allow that the principle of electromechanical equivalence is exemplified, without going into the detail of structure. Neils Bohr, a Danish physicist formulated this planetary idea, and atoms so conceived are sometimes called Bohr's atoms.

A magnet is an energy system differentiating its elementary energies by diffusing the positive energy to one pole and the negative to the other.

The homogeneity of energy throughout all of its transformations, accommodating itself to the heterogeneous forms of mat-

ter in which it may be immanent, reveals that it is rudimentary and quantitative in character, and that its various forms, short of dissipation, are due to its configuration with matter. One may think of energy and structure separately, but only arbitrarily; for one must ascribe energy to every concrete body or system as essentials of namicity.

Every determined form of matter has some stability in that orientation, in which it persists until some extraneous force is brought to bear upon it, or some intrinsic instability reveals itself.

Such is true of both chemical and physical states. However there are in chemical reactions selective affinities of elements that effect results.

CHAPTER SIX

VITALITY AND BIOLOGICAL EXTENSION

I.

THE VITAL ORDER OF THE REAL—We have noticed the accommodation of rudimentary energy to heterogeneous forms of matter, and the concentration of more than normal in small stabilized bodies. All of that is within the principle of mechanical equivalence. But vitality is a lifting power, creating individuals above the level of such equivalence, and extending matter, in new forms, to implementary organs and bodies; whence the idea of biological extension. Vitality, in the exertion of life, builds new forms of structure to meet the mechanical needs of the organism, and, overcoming the entropy of matter pulling against the buoyancy of life, dominates the organic life of the individual.

Theoretical physics recognizes a quantum theory; a theory that energy is absorbed or emitted by an entity in discontinuous quantities, effecting a kind of atomic action.

But the exertia of life is continuous, beginning in heredity and continuing in all of the attainments of growth and propagation.

II.

Heredity—The Abbot Mendel, conducted in the Nineteenth Century, a series of experiments in hybridization of peas, in which he kept an accurate pedigree record showing the number of individuals in each generation, and the dissimilar kinds, which he classed as dominant and recessive. The results were such as to indicate the applicability of law to the appearance of this or that character in the offspring.

In later years the records of these experiments received much consideration, and were followed by experiments of many others verifying the results, and developing a theory of heredity which is frequently referred to as the Mendelian theory.

This Mendelian theory has played a part in the science of genetics, that portion of biology concerned with heredity, variations, development, and evolution. From the accumulated facts of genetic experimentations has developed a theory of *genes;* that is, that the hereditary elements of the individual are paired elements or *genes* in the material called chromosomes; and that such *genes* are held together in a number of linkage groups.

In such biologic thought, the *genes* are regarded as actual as the atom.

But such analytic scientific seeking to differentiate an agent for every function, and then leaving the problem to an inference of mechanical co-ordination, does not reveal the whole truth

in heredity. A more synthetic logic must be invoked in the recognition that all such parts and function are involved in a unamicity of the whole, whence the character impetus that makes such *genes*, if there be such organs, what they are. And the assignment to inferred physical agents of too great part in the important function of propagation should be avoided.

III.

Activities of the Organism—The action of the organism is unamic, as distinguished from dynamic action. And while the action of the organism upon its environment may be called, in a sense, dynamic, it is wholly unlike the dynamic action of matter. Such an organism is better regarded as a unamic energy system, breaking down rudimentary matter and energy, and transmuting them into protoplasm and cells that are built in the body, giving it character.

And while rudimentary matter and energy implement such character, they are only servient to it; for the organism brings to bear a power of its own which turns the rudimentary elements to its own vital use.

For instance, when sunlight falls on a green leaf, the leaf exerts an organic function of the potency of the plant, which dominates the situation and converts the external energies to the internal use of the plant.

This table upon which I am writing is an interesting thing. A chemist may remind me that it is substance into which is incorporated by chemical action minerals and inorganic materials having no such organization of their own. A physicist may tell me that it is a mass of electrons knocking below the paper in

such configuration that I cannot see them, but, nevertheless, keeping the paper in place. And others may observe the size and strength of the structure. But none of these, nor all of them together, tell the whole story of this table; for the story of a tree before a woodsman felled it is part of the story of this table. And that is the story of a vital impetus from ancestral sources, renewed through successive generations until a tiny seed was cast into an environment which it subdued to itself in the production of such tree, though it had to cut across the energy lines of all of the material used by it. And that accomplished, the tree, defying gravity and storms, stood there, rooted in a laboratory of earth, effecting chemical reactions no chemist can explain, much less effect. And dividing its further labor among trunk, and branches, and foliage, it attacked the whole of its environment, feeding thereon, and transforming their substances and energies into that of itself. But now, that impetus, that vital positive in the pattern of which a configuration of matter and organization was a tree, is gone; and the very natural forces that were then servient to life are now destructively working on these boards to reduce them to the lowest material level. Entropy has done its work in destroying that system, and will continue until the elementary energies are released in their simplest forms.

IV.

The Law of Biogenesis—The law of biogenesis, which means that living organisms are derived only from pre-existing living organisms, is well established in all experience, and is accepted as a universal truth. And it is obvious that there is a vital con-

tinum through successive generations, reproducing similar individuals having structural parts and organs performing biological functions in the appropriation and use of energy and matter so long as they serve the vital synthesis, and excreting them when they are no longer usable in the exertion of living.

Metabolism is a physiological process in such exertion. In its process called anabolic, it transmutes matter and energy from their normal states into the kinesis of the vital state, modifies their natural texture, and conditions the substances to the relations of conjoined organs and functions, in the vital synthesis; and at the same time stores up potential energies in appropriate combinations. And then as the organism's work or vitality requires, metabolism, in its katabolic process, breaks down such combinations into lower and more stable forms, releasing free energy for the use of the organism. Substances undergoing these physico-chemical changes in the unamic process of building up, constitute the living matter called protoplasm. In animals such are restricted to the building up of substances from organic material, while most plants build carbohydrates, fats, and proteides from inorganic substances.

In such processes, protoplasm and cells flow in the unamic exertia of life in the constitution of the individual. And though the organism may be subjected to pressures of gravity, atmospheres, seas, or other forces, or many of them together, it is able to determine within itself the effects of these and other stimuli, and to reasonably sustain its individuality and biological efficiency until the life is destroyed.

V.

Animal Life—In the lowest forms of animal life, of which the amoeba may be taken as an example, irritability, contractility, mobility, assimilation of nutrition, and the propagation of offspring are general characteristics before there is any appreciable differentiation of parts sufficient to account for them other than that they are functions of the whole. One must assume biological completeness for the amoeba in manifesting such characteristics, and in exhibiting such capacity, as it does, to turn stimuli, both internal and external, to its vital account. This little mass of ugly substance, almost flowing in its movements, propagates its kind by division, imposing on material substances it contacts processes of which such substances are otherwise incapable. It is very unlike the media in which it lives; for it is alive.

With multicellular animals, animals of more complex organization, there are divisions of labor corresponding with differentiations of parts or organs, among which such labor is divided, and through which specialized parts the whole exercises its functions.

Vitality brings matter under the laws of individuality. In its metabolic processes, the individual gathers from its environment, bringing nutrition into the rythm of life in the cellular organization and the movement of cells in the building and repairs of the structure. And this matter is subjected to the law of the cell; and the cell, in turn, is subject to the law of the organ, of which it is a part; and the organs are subject to the laws of the organism as a whole; and the organism is of the character and limitation of the species to which it belongs.

The organism has a potency of its own, transcending, in its functions, the mechanism of matter, while raising matter to the perfection of its own tissues and organs.

The real defines a succession of positive entities; positive unants in their respective constitutions and the laws of their relations with environment.

The vegetable is, with respect to the inorganic, a potisive in its own character; its laws operating upon the inorganic which is otherwise only relative to it. The animal is a higher positive in its own character, and in its unamic effects upon the vegetable and other nutrient substances. The psychic capacities obtaining in the biological in the ascending scale of life, effect graduation of different species and their adaptation to their respective spheres of subsistence in which they find themselves; culminating in the autonomy of rational and moral consciousness in mankind. And thus there is an increase of reality in each successive character, actualizing potentials not found in lower forms, manifesting through the series, vitality, sensibility, intelligence, rationality, and spirit.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THEORIES OF MIND

HOW WE MAY KNOW—The question of how one may know arises here, as elsewhere in human thinking; and especially with respect to the relation of mind and body, frequently referred to as the mind-body problem.

The brain and nerves constitute a system of which the brain is, as it were, a central power station, in which converge the lines of neural forces, functioning in two respects; organically, in respect of the physiological processes and other forces in biological extension; and serviently, in respect of mind.

Four different theories of such relation may be mentioned: The epiphenomenal, action of the body upon the mind, and the dependency of mind on the body. Behaviorism that man is without instinct or consciousness and is a mere unit of behavior. Parallelism, allowing the existence of consciousness and the concomitance of body and mind as parallel forces, but not otherwise related except as the one may be the function of the other. And the interaction of body and mind.

Touching epiphenomalism, this is a materialistic theory and is very attractive, because the physical so conspicuouosly in-

trudes in human experience that it may be mistaken for the source of all phenomena. But the person is a unant having mind—the intellectual or intelligence power of man, the moral liberty of spirit, and is otherwise dominant of the mechanisms of the body, making the body servient to the mind.

Behaviorism denies the existence of instinct and consciousness; but allows thinking, holding that thinking is a kind of behavior. It reduces all behavior to the elements of "stimulus" and "response." Stimuli present to the senses, whether due to internal activities of the organism or contact of external environment, incite responses directly; but objects not present to the senses are effectual stimuli through the representation of words; words being a kind of thinking, or rather, verbal acts calling up ideas and absent objects with like effect as if the stimuli were immediate to the senses.

Behaviorists regard the active capacities of new born infants as groups of unconditioned responses; and that such are conditioned in experience or activity in the combinations of new experiences with the old, or by the exclusion of the former directions by new trends.

In the Gestalt school of psychology, the integration of different experiences in the solution of a problem is called a "Gestalt" *i.e.*, a combination of grouping.

Of course, during the same time old responses are being unconditioned as new ones are conditioned; and behaviorism supposes the continuance of such process through life.

There is an increasing dominance of language habits in the development of the child, and in some measure during later life.

The behaviorist regards this as progress in thinking behavior, and not as reflecting the presence of instinct or consciousness;

words being regarded as stimulus substitutes or representative of the ideas and objects they connote or call up.

Behaviorists employ in the laboratory the most rigidly controlled observation of the reaction of sentient being to stimuli. These physiological reactions and the stimuli are regarded as units of action. The objective is, of course, to resolve all such phenomena to material value. But the element of sentient being reflects a value transcending the material.

The person is an entirety, a unamic being, positive of its several functions, for the exercise of which it has separate organs. The term "positive" is employed here as meaning the "casual in relation," rather than a certainty of knowledge. In the vital, and basic to the existence of the person, a psychic internal element of character enters into the personal result which is usually called sensibility or sense.

The self is determinative of this function and of its dominance of the still lower biological functions of metabolism. Next higher is instinct; and that is climaxed with sensory consciousness.

Now, the personal self is positive of this function, and its content of sensation. The behaviorists call this mental state, *behavior*. In the nomenclature of the current psychology it is called a sense percept, a definite state of consciousness. And whether such be called behavior or consciousness, the result is the same. But the term "consciousness" best comports with the concepts of more rational thought. It may well be called conscious psychic behavior.

Another theory is called Parallelism, a theory that mind and body are co-ordinates and act concomitantly, but not upon one another. A very difficult theory to explain.

This theory admits the existence of consciousness; but regards

body and mind more in the nature of parallel functions of one another. It suffers from the idea that body and mind are co-ordinate.

Another is that of interaction of mind and body. This theory is much more reasonable than either of the others; but it suffers measurably from faults similar to some of those present in behaviorism, and from others similar to the idea of co-ordinate factors, as in parallelism.

It is easier to appreciate the relations of oxygen and hydrogen in the formation of water than that of body and mind.

In the chemical and molecular activities of matter, the namicity is manifest in aspects of elemental energies and dynamic action, mechanically determined. But in the vital order the relations are much more complex; the relations in such respects are those of a unamic agent effecting results within itself.

The fault common to the aforementioned theories of parallelism and interaction is that mind and body are taken as separate entities, or separate realms, engendering the difficulty of discovering their relation. In such case a more synthetic logic is applicable than in discovery of the relations of a plurality of things. The mind is a capacity of the personal self, and the body is the body of the same self.

It is I that am identical with the personal self, and it is in my mind that I think of my body. The nerves and brain are parts of the body, functioning in its organic activities and exertion of living. And in addition to that division of labor, they are biologic extensions servient to the higher psychic character of the individual.

For instance, light waves impinging on the retina of the eye stimulate the nerves, which sense effect is transmitted to the

brain in processes below the threshold of consciousness, but effecting a condition of mental cognition.

Now, there is no single science to which this series of events may be referred for explanation. There are the external stimuli, referable to physical laws for explanation; the chemical and physical reactions of nerves and brain, in biological extension, and the mental act of perception. They are actions so dissimilar that the processes cannot be taken as analogous to anything in the chemical or physical processes; nor as analogous to any other kind of relations in nature, except in life. The unity essential to this mental ascription of meaning to externality must be found in the whole character of the percipient as one of its divisions of labor, and while there is a unique power of brain, the mental action is of the potency of the whole, and the cognition may be said to be a character function superimposed by the personal self, or unamic entirety, on the specific chemical and physical reactions of the involved organs; the self acting mentally in the cognition of a phenomenon.

For instance, nerves and brain function in the character of Extension, approximating the idea of "Extension" as defined by Spinoza; while the mental action is "Thought," the integrity of which rests upon the actuality of Mind, that capacity of the thinking subject to entertain character phenomena as distinguished from the specific functions of brain and nerves in the sensation.

And none of these conclusions are invalidated by attributing different activities to separate organs; for the capacities of such organs subsist in the unamicity of the whole, of which such separate organs are but different facilities.

The principle of namic transcendency is applicable here, in

the example of consciousness realizing in itself the significance of movements below its threshold. The self dividing its labor within itself.

It is generally considered that experience, be it sensory, emotional, rational, or volitional, is the way of approach to truth and reality. In that approach, Epistemology, the theory of knowledge, searches for the criteria of truth, while metaphysics is a search for the criteria of reality. But both disciplines, though differing much in other respects, must inquire whether the idea originating in experience or reflection is valid for reality, or is a mere ideal of no value beyond the thought.

Touching such inquiry, the sense determination of the normal mind, of phenomenal unity objective to the thinking subject, which consciousness projects in comprehension of sense situations, gives the assurance of a character function, upon the verity of which all experience and reason must depend, if it satisfies sound judgment and reason.

CHAPTER EIGHT

PSYCHOLOGY AND INTUITION

I.

PSYCHOLOGY AS A SCIENCE—Psychology is usually defined as the science of mind. Its subject matter is consciousness; and mental phenomena are usually classed as cognition, feeling, and will or conation.

However, the terms "science" and "mind" are, in their general meanings, measurably incompatible; for it is by mind that the phenomena of science are cognizable. And their compatibility within the conception of psychology is maintained by regarding science in such a way as to include the phenomena of mind amenable to scientific treatment, and mind as so limited.

And only such mental phenomena as are psychic facts susceptible of verification according to scientific methods are within the conception of psychology as a science. Among such are emotions, subjective cognitions, mental responses, modes in which ideas exist, their quality, intensity, duration, and the forms in which they combine; and will and facts touching the stability and instability of the several functions of mind.

The term "psychology" and various of its derivatives are used

in developing theories, such as experimental psychology, behaviorism and psychiatry. And more generally still in philosophy; for the range of human thought is much broader than these special bodies of phenomena; and mind is so involved in reality itself that the psychic ideas are frequent in thought.

Psychology, as a descriptive science, must regard each mental phenomenon as standing in necessary relation to other phenomena of the same series. And if that principle be applied to will, the spirit potential of man would lack that freedom essential to moral motives and decisions, except as the genesis of such might be referable to some accumulation of conditions originating in a line of phenomena leading to such consequences. And that is a contradiction; for in the absence of freedom of will no conditions of such tendency would develop; for moral decisions are more than mere random thinking. And it is error to suppose that the treatment of psychic facts according to the methods of the positive sciences reveals the whole truth with respect to will.

A descriptive science is but department of knowledge cutting from their possible broader relations bodies of phenomena in uniform sequences in such equivalences of force that each phenomenon stands in relation to others of the same series.

Such procedure is quite dependable in material and some other sciences; but not so upon any hypothesis that mental activities are identical with cerebral actions in the equivalence of their physiological processes.

And if it be asked, Where is the mind? The answer is that it is seen in the Self functioning in the processes of consciousness, and in the conservation of experience and knowledge; and, spiritually, in its willing with respect to its motives and conduct.

And while not distinguishably observable in its substance, it is necessarily inferable from the facts.

Again, Mind is the substantial capacity of the personal self susceptible of the mental states of attention and inattention; and when attentive, consciously revealing to introspection modes of its procedure, the mental elements of sensation and affection, and such other content of thought as may be incident to the occasion.

Sensations are regarded by some psychologists as the ultimate elements of the intellectual life; and affections, as the ultimate constituents of the life of feeling and emotions; and that these and their elaborations constitute psychic facts coming within the purview of psychology as a science.

These elements are brought together, synthesized; and laws applicable thereto are noted as parts of the same science. But to that extent psychology would be but a descriptive science; and it must adventure explanations of conditions under which mental phenomena occur; and it therein becomes a branch of metaphysics susceptible of philosophic treatment. There is opinion that mental processes are conditioned upon physical processes; and that a mental state is to be referred, for explanation, to the bodily conditions underlying it. While other opinion distinguishes a supposed subconsciousness, or sub-liminal process, as conditions of the experience of the supra-liminal mind. And still others explain mind by mind, allowing that mental processes derive from mental activities by a principle of mental causality.

The relation of mind and its content is not of the manner of linear sequence; but rather that of namic transcendency.

Kant conceived that there are things-in-themselves; but he did not adequately explain the introduction of the empirical element in the percept, although he considered that the percept is thought, and is thereby a datum of experience.

Fichte thought that Kant had failed to show the completeness of the principle of sense cognition, and he made the ego to posit the non-ego. And Thomas Reid, the founder of the Scotch school of philosophy, held that the sensation is not the object of the perception, but a sign directing the percipient to real objects of knowledge.

Now, all these are analytic block conceptions, attempting to explain mind, in its behavior, as if it were a thing after the fashion of a compound; and they penetrate so far into the finer traceries of the real that they are conjectural.

Aside from such distinctions, the percept is a function of the mind in consequence of stimuli so congruous with mind that they are within the field of sense cognition, enabling man to look out upon a world containing his body, but otherwise external to him. And by that and his own reflections he builds up a world within himself in which emotions and thought together strive, and this and that of the external world filter in through the avenues of sense; and intellect and reason initiate and plan the execution of purposes, and aesthetics strive to make things beautiful, to lessen the ills that exigencies bring, and moral liberty reveals his spirit autonomy, requiring that he meet and assume responsibilities and perform parts, in the same world, for others as well as for himself.

In that world of thought ethical and spiritual principles stand out as imposed sanctions. Principles not left to his election; but so in the linkage of himself and ultimate reality that they give the greater reward unless thwarted by himself.

And so man as in an extension of relations revealing so much more in him than a mere department of his being, that he should be appraised without the handicap of supposing that mind is but one in a series of neural and cerebral processes.

And there is no theoretical reason why the almost universal opinion of mankind, that there is a moral liberty entailing moral obligations and duties, should be reversed or modified because psychology, as a descriptive science, begins and ends with psychic facts susceptible of scientific verification.

II.

Instinct and Intuition—There are physiological processes in man and beast in the exertia of living, apparently identified only with the biological interests of the organism. But very soon, in the ascending scale of life, appears a capacity of intelligent kind called Instinct. Instincts are affirmative dispositions pertaining to life, of that division of labor by which the organism adjusts itself to essential behavior patterns in respect of extraneous and other variant conditions.

And in the higher organisms they are accompanied with sensory experiences. The bird, for instance, is supposed to build its nest under the guidance of the instincts of its kind, without learning otherwise how to do it. And yet she has the freedom of apprehension enabling her to cope with occasional exigencies of her life, and to choose some and reject other responses, and to engage in promiscuous activities with apparent freedom from fixed behavior patterns.

Both types of labor, that in pursuance of the established behavior patterns and that in the seeming acquisition of occasional experience, are of psychic kind, transcending the type of labor manifest in physiological processes.

Does the bird have the capacity of reflecting upon the objects

of its sensory experience? Some, no doubt, will answer that in one way, and others answer it differently. But this fact seems to stand out: There is a psychic positive, transcending the physiological processes, registering behavior patterns commensurate with the needs of the life, anterior to such individual experiences; and that the sensory experiences are but variations the better accommodating the organism to the variable in its environment.

These experiences contribute to the adequacy of such instincts, but only within the scope of the interests to which the instincts are fundamental.

Mankind has a wealth of instincts, but many of the human instincts are inhibited by greater free intelligence. The psychic positive in mankind, attaining the capacity called mind, pertains to the whole life of the individual,—emotional, intellectual, and spiritual, as well as to behavior patterns and sensory experience; and therefore is fundamental to a larger intelligence than that of instinct.

And notwithstanding it may be thought by some that the mind contains no innate ideas, there is an innate intelligence touching its larger and spiritual interests. And may it not contribute to ideas of experience and reason addressed to such interests? Does not the psychic positive we call mind, pertain to the whole interests of the self? Certainly so. And though such intelligence may not become articulate except in ideas of experience or reason, it is intuitive, and makes its contribution.

Bergson's idea of a slumbering consciousness which may be wound off in instinctive action, or wound up in intuition, has some value.

The term "intuition" has been employed with many meanings; but the constant through all of them is that of the immediacy of apprehension, apprehensions independent of inference.

One is intuitively conscious of self-existence; of life, as experienced; of a content of consciousness; of sensations, which he may very reasonably attribute to something objective to himself; and of some principles as well as of objects. That is, there is an urge of the innate intelligence with respect to fundamental human interests.

The ideas of right and wrong are intuited, in principle; but articulate only in instances of will, motive, or conduct brought by a thinker to the tests of some standard. And notwithstanding different peoples may have different standards of right and wrong, such concepts are issues of spiritual relations between husband and wife, parent and child, individuals and their associates, citizens and their political communities, and other relations involving honesty, sympathy, justice, and other appreciable virtues, involving personal motives, will, and conduct judged at the bar of the same person's conscience.

The term is sometimes applied to mathematical axioms and principles, and judgments necessarily following therefrom; and sometimes to logical judgments, seemingly so obviously true that they might be taken as self-evident. But however certain a logical conclusion may seem to be, there inheres in it a possible contingency; for if the major premise of the deduction is untrue, the conclusion cannot be true. And the idea of positive knowledge emphasized by Comte, in his positive philosophy, does not mean inerrancy; but only knowledge derived from deduction, rather than from traditional or metaphysical assumptions.

However, there are principles that seem to be self-evident, the contraries of which are unthinkable. Universality may be taken as a criterion of logical truth; and the metaphysical first principle, that for every effect there must be a cause, which is also fundamental of the sciences, shows that necessity, in such respect, is also a criterion of truth.

CHAPTER NINE

EVOLUTION

I.

TELEOGICAL VIEW OF EVOLUTION—It seems necessary to assume that the universe is related to a positive cause or adequacy of Being transcending the limitations of natural law; and yet persisting in the inevitability of such law and the moral imperative of mankind, and thus the laws of primal Being, expressive of an Infinite. And while the problem cannot be brought within the limits of time, yet time has left a train of changes that betray beginnings and suggest progression or evolution of some kind in the phenomenal determinations in nature.

The term "evolution" is of very general meaning, It connotes an unfolding or development. In biology, the development of a germ or an organ from a simple to a more complex state; and development otherwise, as in the evolution of a system of schools, or of a society, or of a state.

It is also used to denote a theory that all life is derived from one or a few rudimentary forms, whence have evolved the multiplicity of forms that we see in the world today.

Such theory and the fact of evolution should be distinguished. It is obvious that species, including persons, undergo some changes through successive generations; changes within the limits of their respective natures. And there seems to have been a general progression of organic forms throughout geologic time; probably the result, principally, of the appearance from time to time of new genera in successive ages. It is not evident, however, that forms adapted to earlier conditions evolved with time and change into forms differing radically from the forms of earlier maturity; for the adaptation of a species or genera to a given environment would necessarily tend to stabilize it in that form and within its existing limitations; and, consequently, lessen its capacity to undergo any great margin of change. Along with the geologic record of changing forms are also records of previously extinct forms which evidently could not change successfully with changing conditions.

Any theory of evolution must justify itself in terms of natural law; calling for distinctions between the given and variations within them; for no one can well insist upon the evolution of something from nothing.

Touching the theories of evolution, they may be classified generally as mechanistic and vitalistic. And since it is obvious that mechanism is not congruous with life, except in servient relations; and that entropy ever pulls downward against the buoyance of life; and that life is the greater state of Being, the subject of evolution should be approached from the vitalistic viewpoint, and as being of teleological significance.

Nature is a system of parts distinguishable as the several parts differ in their distribution in the hierarchy of laws. The physical constitutes a basis of matter and energy, in which the namic, overcoming the inert, effects determinations according to electro-

magnetic, chemical, mechancal, and astronomical uniformities, in an orderliness appropriate to life; as if creating and conserving, in material combinations, energies releasable to streams of life. And living things are adapted to their respective spheres of subsistence, in a vast spread of biological extensions, as if in pursuance of purposes to such ends.

In the higher of these forms, psychological characters exhibit intelligible trends of creation. And in mankind moral responsibilities are imposed by ethical and spiritual laws.

It is not conceivable that such a far-reaching and complex system obtained by chance; or otherwise than as the expression of a supernamicity determining it, in the design of Determining Will. And so far as the idea of evolution is valid, it is of a teleological evolution, unfolding creative forces.

And whether the universe has existed eternally or was created in time, if chance be excluded, and it must be, it matters not whether the patterns of the finite were filled in through a process of evolution or in a more summary manner.

And since natural laws are effective only in respect of the creatures, and could not have been the creators; it follows that the progression in nature is the expression of a more transcending namicity than derivable from any of its structural factors alone. And while nature's benevolence rises to great levels of endowment, man, in the power of his own genius, purposes, and discovering latent forces in nature, he brings them under control and greatly magnifies his sphere of existence; while there obtains, as if a strand in general purpose, a moral imperative of the soul prompting moral conceptions and enacting moral laws impelling man, by the irrevocable mandate of his own nature, to act as a moral agent, or to suffer the consequences of his dereliction.

Touching organic life, Lamark supposed that there is a fundamental unity in the animal world, and a progressive development; and that the main influences tending to effect outward changes are the use and disuse of organs; species varying under different external conditions. From that followed the notion that offspring inherit acquired characters of their ancestors; a proposition much controverted. On the other hand, Darwin attributed variations and the origin of species principally to natural selection; the idea being that the more fit have, in the competition of life, the greater chance to survive and propagate their kind. Others have thought that there has been actual progression along distinct lines, and that slight variations necessarily determine possible lines along which changes and descent proceed. Some have contended that changes are by sudden jumps or mutations; while others insist that they are gradual. Some attribute much to environment and habit, while others minimize such effects. The Mendelian theory of descent, emphasizing the continuation of hereditary factors, has received much attention. Weissmann contended that the power of reproduction is concentrated in the germ cells, as distinguished from the body cells; and that the body cells being concerned with the nutrition of the organism, and in that respect specialized, have lost the reproductive power.

Parallelism in biology does not require the explanation that forms of life are derived from one or a few rudimentary forms; for similar modes and necessities of growth and reaction to environment may very well account for likenessess of bodily forms and habits of species of different stocks.

Nor is the idea of recapitulation, the theory that the development of the individual is a brief and simple repetition or recapitulation of the species, of any great significance. Here, as

in any theory of evolution, origins must be accounted for; and the assumption that all life evolved from one or a few rudimentary forms does not account for the vital impetus of that one or few rudimentary forms. And if something more than evolution is necessary to account for such one or few rudimentary forms, that something more is the significant factor, not only in the origins, but also in the developments of life, besides which emphasis on structural forms dwindles into insignificance.

It is more reasonable to suppose that life was potential in the order of the real, and was actualized in its respective forms by the same might that determined other natural forces; and that evolution is not a creative principle, but only a term descriptive of the progression and development effected by more basic creative forces.

II.

Theories of Herbert Spencer—Herbert Spencer, one of the great evolutionist theorists of the past century, undertook to show that matter contains the elements of which life and intelligence are organized. His principal point of reference was the "persistence of force." And touching the indestructibility of matter and energy, he deduced the transformations and equivalence of forces, life, the acquisition of knowledge, and the development of society,—all from a process of evolution, defined as the integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion, during which matter passes from an unmodified, incoherent homogeneity, to a definite, coherent heterogeneity, with the retained motion undergoing a parallel transformation, developing

higher from lower forms of existences. Such he attributed to the instability of the homogeneous and the multiplication of effects.

The reverse of that, the disintegration of matter and the absorption of motion, he called dissolution.

He seems to have regarded "Persistence of Force" as of the same character in all relations, committing himself to mechanical causation and the explanation of phenomena by the laws of matter in motion. Such notion, in its approach to the unity of nature, is obviously inadequate. The mere persistence of force, regardless of kind, cannot be taken as effecting the integration of an organism; for it is in the respect that the vital impetus transcends the mechanical motion that life is manifest—the unant being a more highly organized entity, reacting upon the rudimentary energies of matter. Furthermore, reason and the accepted law of biogenesis stand against the transmission of elementary energies into the energies of biological functions, except under the impetus of life itself.

And while Spencer treated extensively of organs and their functions, he did not discover the principle essential to their adjustments and actions in the unamic exertion of the organism, as a unit. Of course, there are different aspects of such exertion, the specialized activities of different organs, but such are only differentia of a whole state of life.

Spencer's error here is the same as that of all materialistic philosophers. Such philosophers assume that all phenomena are in consequence of a material stratum or substance. And that the biologic, psychologic, and social phenomena are accidental to the physical forces persisting in body and brain; and that in so far as such forces may seem to signify more, they are illusory. Yet they cannot develop a materialistic philosophy

without premises transcending the reality legitimately attributable to matter, as such.

According to Spencer, knowledge arises, not merely through the experience of individuals; but through the experience of the race.

And that man knows only phenomena; and that any attempt to exceed that limit leads only to the Unknowable.

He held the theory that religion originated in ancestral ghost worship; a superstition of some primitive peoples.

Touching primitive religions, the idea of the moral imperative is not irrelevant to the subject; for such people usually had the idea that some things and some kinds of conduct are good or useful, and that other things and some conduct are evil and to be avoided. That is, taboo. Taboo means the setting apart of a thing as consecrated or as accursed, that some things are sacred and some things are evil.

Comte held that knowledge is in what he called the theological state when it supposes the phenomena under consideration to be due to immediate volition in the object or in some supernatural being. And from the viewpoint of those investigating primitive religions, such state of knowledge is called *animism.* This upon the supposition that when a savage cannot understand phenomena, he personifies their causes, and supposes, from the analogy of his own body, that spirits dwell in such natural bodies and are responsible for their conduct. And that mountains, rocks, rivers, stars, and other natural phenomena are the forms or abodes of spirits, some of which were worshiped by them; while others worshiped ancestors.

In such states of knowledge, magicians found opportunities to pretend to special insight or knowledge, and to be able to invoke the aid of good spirits, and to avoid the harm of evil ones.

Therefore, the development of magic, refinements of which may be found in many theosophical notions of the present day.

Certain North American Indians had a custom of describing tribes and families by a totem or animal whose name and symbol they bore; employing these totems also in connection with religious assemblies and observances, and often as marking stages of other development as well. Also the idea of blood brotherhood existed among some ancient totem classes, created equally by birth and by the transference of blood of members of the clan to the body of a candidate for initiation, or from the candidate to members of the clan. And thus a relationship that could not be so well expressed otherwise, enriched the language with metaphors of varying kind; some of which are met with in Christian symbolism.

Jesus, speaking at Capernaum, referred to Himself as the bread of life, and spoke of the importance that His hearers eat His flesh and drink His blood. And He, learning that some of His disciples murmured about the saying, said: "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." John 6:63.

And likewise, it is not totem value that the worshiper sees in the elements representing the broken body and spilt blood of his Lord, in the Eucharist or Lord's Supper; but it is the spiritual significance of the symbolism.

And the idea of atonement, propitiating bad spirits or making amends to good ones for wrongs committed, and sometimes ceremonies of communion, obtained among primitive peoples, by offerings and sacrifices of grains, animals, and sometimes of human beings.

The sacrifices and offerings of the ancient Hebrews, which we shall notice, later, were made as requisites of the worship

of the one true God, of whom they would allow no image or objective representation.

But as knowledge advanced, as if in epistemic evolution, the moral and spiritual understanding, as with the ancient Hebrews unfolded more and more, differentiating from primitive notions the esthetical, the more beautiful; and moral sentiments. Among the Hebrews, the conception that moral principles are of divine sanction obtained. And why should we not evaluate soberly the primitives, in whose hearts the laws of God were written; and that in the light of the principle, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

And there were great arrays of pagan gods, personifying great impersonal forces of nature and sublime spectacles of creation, inspiring the dramatization of beauty, nobility, and human courage, as of the good; and the tragedies of life as the fates overcame men and gods, long prevailing in the great empires of Greece and Rome and empires of the further east; empires and religions that have perished with the peoples whose thought and life they interpreted. But a spiritual strand ran through it all.

Recurring to Spencer: Spencer employed the term "form," as in the evolution from lower to higher forms of existences, attributing the changes to the accumulations of modifications caused by the intercourse of the organism with its environment. Such might be allowed as a secondary principle of development; but it does not account for any primary cause of evolution.

Spencer's idea that knowledge arises, not merely through the experience of the individual, but also through the experiences of the race, approximates Kant's conception of the categories of the understanding; but differing in this: Spencer thought of the mind and its capacity of understanding as a social deposit, accumulated in the course of race experience; while Kant

thought of them as *a priori* powers of mind. Their respective philosophies allow the existence of these intellectual powers, inferably above mere mechanical activities. Such differences merely raise issues about origins; but if all origins are within the positive of a super-namicity, such differences relate merely to the manner of Becoming, and are of little significance in respect of the resulting reality.

Spencer, while defining life as the continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations, a definition equally applicable to interaction of matter, admitted that he did not conceive of life within the limits of physico-chemical terms.

He allowed some kind of relation between science and religion, in that he considered seriously, and discussed, what he conceived to be conflicts between science and religion, the while proposing a reconciliation of such.

In his *First Principles*, he said: "If religion and science are to be reconciled, the basis of reconciliation must be this deepest, evident, and most certain of all facts—the power which the universe manifests to us is utterly inscrutable." And, again, "Common sense asserts the existence of a reality. Objective science proves that this reality cannot be what we think it; as subjective science shows why we cannot think of it as it is; and, yet, we are compelled to think of it as existing; and in this assertion of a Reality utterly Inscrutable in nature, religion finds an assertion essentially coinciding with her own. We are obliged to regard every phenomenon as a manifestation of some power by which we are acted upon; though omnipresence is unthinkable, yet, as experience discloses no bounds to the diffusion of phenomena, we are unable to think of limits to the presence of this Power; while the criticisms of science teach us that this Power is incomprehensible. And this consciousness of an Incomprehen-

sible Power, called Omnipresent from an inability to assign its limits, is just that consciousness on which religion dwells."

The forces viewed by Spencer, and to him seemingly chaotic, are the phenomenal manifestations of the subaltern states of the universe in which dissimilar laws of the subject matter of the different sciences are the ways of specific functions; and he never grasped the transcendental in which their unities obtain. But he allowed the variableness of phenomena to obscure, as if by a cloud, that reality grasped by reason and faith which, though unseen, is revealed by that which is seen. He rested his philosophy upon appearances which he thought so deceptive that the real cannot be what we think it is. Yet his exhaustive treatment of things and forces, within their respective natures, are so attractive that but few notice that his similarities are of the most general kind. The altruistic emotion of a mother for her young, instinctive in an animal mother, presents, in addition, a moral problem to the human mother, who lives, not only in the emotional life of her species, but also in that urge of moral forces inspiring ideals of right and wrong, and the constraints of moral law. He seems to have thought that such states of Being are but idiosyncrasies of the fortuity of matter—just variations from the normal directions of persisting physical force.

Auguste Comte, author of the *Positive Philosophy,* realized that the emotional life, in its passions, fears, hopes, hates, sympathies, and loves, often uneasy and sometimes violent, is significant; and he attempted to develop individual excellence by the application of a religion of humanity; but his, as all intellectual efforts, failed to subdue the animal in man. And the world, in this decade of man at his highest intellectual development, has witnessed the destructiveness of genius exceeding all previous moral comprehension. While nature gives a freedom

of will, allowing man opportunity to escape from its fatality, it does not obviate the moral conflict in the exercise of that freedom; and man is ever at the bar of human destiny, and is bound to choose the higher or the lower. Nature fixes its processes up to this liberty of man, and there human responsibility for conduct begins, and thenceforth the proper governing laws are ethical and spiritual.

Touching religion, Spencer says further: "Two suppositions are open to us; the one that the feeling which responds to religious ideas resulted, as with other human faculties, from an act of special creation; the other that it, in common with the rest, arose by a process of evolution. If we adopt the first of these alternatives, universally accepted by our ancestors and by the immense majority of our contemporaries, the matter is at once settled; man is directly endowed with the religious feeling by the creator, and to the creator it designedly responds. If we adopt the second alternative, then we are met by the questions—What are the circumstances to which the genesis of the religious feeling is due? And—What is the office?

"We are bound to entertain these questions; and we are bound to find answers to them. Considering all faculties, as we must on this supposition, to result from accumulated modifications caused by the intercourse of the organism with its environment, we are obliged to admit that there exist in the environment certain phenomena or conditions which have determined the growth of the feeling in question; and so we are obliged to admit that it is as normal as any other faculty. Add to this, that as, on the hypothesis of the development of lower forms into higher, the end towards which the progressive changes, directly or indirectly, tend, must be adaptations to the requirements of existence; we are forced to infer that this feeling is in some

way conducive to human welfare. Thus both alternatives contain the same ultimate implication. We must conclude that the religious sentiment is either directly created, or is created by the slow action of natural causes; and whichever of these conclusions we adopt, requires us to treat the religious sentiment with respect."

The distinction which Spencer attempted as to the possible origin of the religious feelings is irrelevant; for primal origin in either case must be attributed to God.

Man, while having intelligence unfolding in sense and intellect in respect of general knowledge, has, also, that deeper life of spirit, a consequence to which nature, as a system, tends; and thus the religious sentiments and feelings are more than mere social deposits; they are stirrings of conscience in man's spirit relation to ultimate reality, God.—Man's response to a power not his own, that makes for righteousness.

III.

Meliorism—It is said that the term "Meliorism" passed through changes of use meaning faith which affirms the power of man to lessen the evil and to increase the amount of positive good in the world.

Such is a rational conclusion relevant to the subject of ethics. Ethics, pertaining as it does to ideals of what should be rather than what is, is called the normative science—the sciences of rules or norms; and it is, therefore, distinguishable from the more factual sciences.

Men have long considered the subject of ethics from the standpoint of phenomena and their laws. The oldest, and, in many

respects, the most important aspect of such subject is that of "Supreme Good" as the ultimate end of human conduct. And "the greatest happiness" theory, stated in many different forms, seems to have furnished the most pronounced conception of the supreme good. Such involved and involves experiences of pleasure and pain; that is, physical pleasure and pain—experiences of pain developing understanding of that which is to be avoided, and pleasure affording statisfaction in activities conducive to physical well being; and intellectual and emotional pleasure and pain—experiences significant of the good and the bad in the widest ranges of life.

In the latter part of the Eighteenth Century and the earlier part of the Nineteenth, pronounced opinions on ethical subjects were advanced in England, Archdeacon Paley and others considered virtue as the doing good to mankind, in obedience to the will of God, and for the sake of everlasting happiness. This including the utility of virtue in the interest of the actor, is some times referred to as egoistic utilitarianism.

In the ferment of English thought, then in course, Jeremy Bentham and James Mill developed a system of thought which they called scientific ethics, the main principles of which were associational psychology and hedonism—hedonism pertaining to pleasure. They considered it a utilitarian system for the making of a better world.

John Stuart Mill, the greatest of the utilitarians, developed the doctrine further. And Saint-Simon, a French author and reformer, and Auguste Comte, the French philosopher heretofore mentioned, and associated for a time with Saint-Simon from whom it is said Comte acquired some of his radical ideas, developed these trends of thinking into a doctrine of "Altruism." It seems that Comte, in his doctrine of a religion of humanity,

coined the term for his ethical theory; meaning that one's duty is to live for others or for humanity generally.

Such stocks of ideas with the evolutionary ethics following the biological discoveries of Darwin and the philosophies of Herbert Spencer, raised the question whether morality is more than deductions from the laws of biology and sociology.

The doctrine that pleasure, frequently referred to as hedonism, is the end of life was early entertained by the Cyrenians, and further developed by Epicurus. That was the fundamental idea in utilitarianism as a theory of morals; while, as a political theory, the fundamental idea was well expressed "as the greatest good to the greatest number."

As a theory of morals, the moral significance of a developed philosophy, is best seen in ideas of John Stuart Mill, that actions are right in proportion as they tend to produce happiness. By happiness being meant pleasure and the absence of pain, the definition of these being in the realm of variable opinion; but usually circumscribed by the priority of intellectual pleasures over the sensuous and the mere literal of physical pleasure. And that actions are wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of pleasure.

This philosophic theory embraces as part of its content the ideas of "egoism" and "altruism"; egoism meaning, in ethics, the striving to procure personal pleasure or advantage, as distinguished from altruism, or the effort to benefit others.

And while these ideas are germane to sound ethical theory, they were largely crystallized by intellectuals as elements in the evolutionary process; and, therefore, as contributing nothing more than a shade of meaning to a materialistic outlook.

Now, the term "Meliorism" suggests the idea that faith has the advantage of a freedom of will in a field of spiritual moment;

and that the hard and fast letter of any definition is inadequate to the full view of moral idealism. And that moral evolution and culture are attributable more to the moral nature of man seeking its larger life, than to the variable and passing theories of any age. And that the free spirit of man fairly reveals the constant of idealism seeking its ultimate assurance in more than intellectual definitions and theories.

The contribution to utilitarianism by Spencer seems to have stemmed from his theory of secondary evolution in bodies more plastic than the usual condition of matter, bodies yielding to the persistence of forces in deviations caused by varying effects of environment, organizing patterns of increasingly greater namic values in the evolution of higher from lower forms. And that particulars so organized coalesce in unities of more extended organization.

Comte classified the sciences by beginning with the most general in extension and ascending to the most significant in intension. That is, he began with mathematics, including number, geometry, and mechanics, as the science having the most general attributes; and continued the series through Astronomy, as the science depending on the truth of mathematics and the particular truths distinguishing it from that science; and, further, through Physics, Chemistry, Biology, and Sociology, according to the same principle; the principle that each of the series is more particular than the member immediately before it, and depending on the facts of all of the members preceding it.

However, mankind being in the category of sociology, and having the moral liberty of spirit, manifests volitions transcending the merely organic functions; and the main significance of the utilitarian philosophy was developed from that vantage point.

Any attempt to deduce morality solely from biology and sociology must assume a process imparting its namicity to the concretes collectively known as nature, and sublimating experience and individual intelligence in a social intelligence or consciousness constituting a genetic force adequate to improve and improving the world in things and situations satisfying desires or so harmonizing desires as to afford equal satisfaction to all.

Biology is the science of a heritage which man shares with the animal kingdom; and his own passions and acquisitiveness apart from moral constraints, would not develop a society more stable than they. The higher animals illustrate the situation. Their social instincts are merely consonant to their biological needs.

Of course, the cosmic processes of growth and development were and are causal in the differentiation of energies in the elements constituting organic nature and organic life; and human development and mind and organized society are continuous with such processes; but such processes are only secondary causes in nature, pertaining to the phenomenality of the real. And while there has been epistemological evolution—evolution in theories of knowledge, touching the meaning of utility in human life and advancing improvements in culture; yet the moral consciousness and general moral experience, issues of the spirit in man enlightened by the inspiration of the Almighty, have been the greater and the principal forces in the amelioration of human society; negativing the conception of an evolutionary mechanism or biological determinism as effecting more than their contribution, if any, to the sum of organic functions.

Touching Christians ethics, Jesus said: "Whosoever will save

his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's, the same shall save it." Mark 8:35.

Such is the spiritual giving of one's self to a cause, and the observance of the ethical code of the gospels, the significance of which we shall notice later.

And we shall now proceed to consider the operations of spiritual forces in the life of mankind, as reflected in the Hebraic-Christian traditions.

CHAPTER TEN

GOD, THE ALMIGHTY

I.

THE SPIRITUAL INTERPRETATION OF THE REAL—Those early Hebrews who were also called Israelites, had the spiritual conception of God; a faith in the existence of Eternal cause, effective in the severalties in nature--God the Creator of all things; a Power adequate to finite existence and the purpose of righteousness. Not existence without purpose; but existence involved in purpose, and, therefore, moral and spiritual laws—divine sanctions.

Now, they had to entertain some philosophy or explanation of the coherence of such faith with their general experiences and conceptions of reality. And, therefore, a spiritual interpretation with which the phenomenal is sufficiently consonant that they conceived the personality of God, and that He is a law giver, inflexible in judgment, but, nevertheless, merciful and righteous altogether. They had no conception of any metaphys-

ical nexus of God and man; but rested on the assurances of faith. And we hear St. Paul, a Christian Jew, saying later: "By grace are you saved, through faith, and that not of yourself, it is the gift of God."

Nor did they seem to have such ideas of progressive development as are largely entertained in this day; and time was not important to their philosophy, and they described things and events in terms of their everyday experiences. Yet they emphasized a spiritual transcendentalism that became the light of the nations.

II.

Hebraic Ideas—The first three chapters of Genesis, our Bible, purports to give us the story of creation and of other related matters, as gathered in early traditions of the Hebrews. They present a few great general truths, standing out in the verbiage of simple narrative of accomplished events and individual lives.

We are told that, in the beginning, "God created the heavens and the earth." Such is a transcendent idea; but it explains away what is incomprehensible, the interminable regression of finite things; and comports with the idea of an absolute cause adequate to the existence of the finite; which idea is presupposed in the finite itself, and in the highest application of the principle of "namic transcendency."

Touching further validity of this inspiration, it is not historical; for it refers to times and events before history began. It is not scientific; for it relates to events transcending the laws giving value to scientific knowledge. It is coupled with an interest deeper than those appearing in historic or scientific phenomena apart from such interest; it is the religious interest. And since such interest exists and has existed in all historic time, it cannot be disregarded in any sound philosophy of the real.

We are told that "The Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground, breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." And again, that "God created man in his own image; in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."

The author or authors of this narrative were conscious of the spirit character of mankind; of the difference between sin and righteousness; of more in the nature they observed than possible in the chaos of an accidental world; and that they could neither understand the actual world nor themselves except in the light of an inspiring faith in God. This is speaking as if they reasoned so; but they, in the morning of the incipiency of faith, were so close to the Eternal that they were the voice of the ages speaking to mankind in first principles of the real.

St. Paul, in writing to the Corinthian Christians about the resurrection, referred to the planting of a seed, and to the coming forth of its plant; and then to the human body: "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." I Cor. 15:44.

And it is obvious that there is a spirit character, a soul manifesting spirit activities, to which the physical body is servient.

The same Genesis account records traditions, accommodated

to such inspirations, expletive of God's dealings in the respects mentioned in Genesis. These traditions may have undergone some changes in form in their long transmissions through the ages; but they probably reflect, substantially, interpretations by their authors and those cohering in the best understanding of the long succession of generations.

We are told that God effected such creation in six days; and He rested from His labors on the seventh day, and hallowed it as the Sabbath. The Christians adopted the first day of the week, the resurrection day, as their Sabbath. This Sabbath, of one day in seven for rest, meditation and worship, is the greatest institution coming out of antiquity or originating in modern time. It seems to be grounded in the deepest human need; and any one of our institutions could be changed or done away with less injury to society than could the Sabbath. And it is quite clear that the Hebrews so esteemed it as to be convinced that it was involved in the plan of creation itself.

And who can say the contrary? They distributed creation in periods of time corresponding with the days of the week. However, it was not till the fourth creative day that the greater light, to govern the day, obviously the sun; and the lesser light, to govern the night, obviously the moon, appeared. The story is not constructed to describe a cosmos; but so as to reveal a religious interest in magnifying the Sabbath, by comparing periods of creation, whatever they may have been, to the days of the week in which the recurrence of their Sabbath had become fixed.

We are told that the Lord God placed the first pair, frequently referred to as Adam and Eve, in a garden, the Garden of Eden, the man "to dress and to keep it." "And the Lord God

commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat. But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." And the narrative relates instances of communications between God and man before the latter sinned. But there lurked in this pair a latent covetousness; and when they understood that this forbidden fruit was good to eat, and that the eating thereof would make them to be as wise as the gods, they ate of it, and fell from their high estate of innocence to that level of human nature that has characterized the race ever since. And these guilty were driven from their ideal surroundings, and a flaming sword, to keep the way of the tree of life, was turned in every direction against their return. Such is fate; evil done may be forgiven, but the injury remains.

This tree of the knowledge of good and evil is described in terms of the peril of human experience—the knowledge of good and evil, exposing every human path to moral hazard. Such fruit is usually attractive, frequently beautiful in the appearance of good; but temptation is always vile. And, in this case, the serpent, the most subtle and despicable of all creation, is named the tempter. That is the excuse they assign for sinning. And thus the idea of an objective, hostile agent of evil, an idea later transferred to satan and the devil, but in this case symbolizing the subtlety of covetousness, a fault persisting in so many bosoms.

This unfolding of great truths and principles to the understanding of a primitive people was accomplished with such effectiveness that it has stood out in both Hebrew and Christian thought as a starting point in sound thinking. It became the philosophy of the faith; and Israel accepted the laws and

commandments of the same God, and her prophets proclaimed his righteousness.

That is, this Genesis exposition of human nature became a reference point in Hebrew thinking; and we hear St. Paul saying: "Wherefore as by one man sin entered the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned: For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression." Romans 5:12-14. He refers to the law of Commandments, given later through Moses and the prophets.

Paul speaks of the violation of law as sin. But while he emphasizes that point, he also brings out other aspects of sin which he associates with human nature itself. And in the same letter, he, speaking of the status of Hebrews and Jews after the giving of the law through Moses at Sinai, says: "There is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law shall perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law; (For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified. For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another;)" Romans 2:11-15.

III.

St. Paul's Characterization of the Law—St. Paul, in writing to the Galatians, said: "The scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore, the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith." Gal. 3:22-24.

And to the Romans: "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. For Moses described the righteousness which is of the law, that the man which doeth those things shall live by them. But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down from above:) Or, Who shall descend into the deep? (That is to bring up Christ again from the dead.) But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith which we preach; That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth into righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Romans 10:4-10.

And Jesus in conversation with Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, said: "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." And answering queries of Nicodemus, he said: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born

of the Spirit is Spirit. Marvel not that I said unto you, Ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but cannot tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." John 3:3-8. And thus the creation continues.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

THE SPIRITUAL DEVELOPMENT OF ISRAEL UNDER DIVINE TUTELAGE

I.

THE DIVINE GUIDANCE—The many centuries of Israel's history reveals the actuality of the spirit nature of man, entertaining faith of a Divine Majesty transcending but nevertheless involving mankind in respect of such spirit nature. And that principle is still essential to the explanation of the whole of the phenomena of life.

We should not think of God as if He were a capricious monarch, issuing decrees for the governance of His subjects according to His whims; but as the source of laws conducive to good, each violation of which entails its own penalty.

God is the divine positive in respect of ethical and spiritual principles; and relative thereto, as in the relation of effect to cause, man is an agent in the expression of such principles. If he is deficient in those respects, he is out of correspondence with his highest nature and in the contradictions of an inadequate

life; but if in such correspondence, he may realize that the principles conducive to his better life express the will of God concerning him. This is not upon the premise that human reason is adequate guidance in things concerning the will of God; but that human reason is not irrelevant to the Divine Immanence, or to the inspirations of the Holy Spirit. Moral responsibility implies the need of moral reason and judgments in the guidance of thought and conduct, and it is man's responsibility to employ the best of these from his available viewpoints, in the exigencies of his life. Along these lines the Hebrews slowly progressed; never questioning the justice of God, but attributing all ill consequences to themselves to just judgments of God for their sins. And that it was incumbent upon them to make compensation of atonement to God for such offenses against Him. Therefore, their approach to God was mediated through sacrifices and offerings symbolizing such compensation and atonement. However, such sacrifices without faith were of no advantage.

Many generations before the law was given to the Hebrews, at Sinai, the patriarch, Jacob, and his descendants preceded by his son, Joseph, whom his brethren had sold into slavery, but who had been favored as the second man in the government, migrated to Egypt, and were favorably treated and given residence by Joseph. But the time came, after Joseph's death, that a Pharaoh arose who knew not Joseph; and who feared the increase of the numbers of this race in his kingdom. To prevent such he subjected them to hard labor; and decreed, among other things, that male children born of the Hebrews should be drowned in the Nile. But when Moses, later the great law giver of the Hebrews, was born, his parents hid him for a time, and then caused him to be placed in an ark of bulrushes at a place in the Nile where the daughter of Pharaoh was accustomed to

bathe. There she found him, and adopted him as her own child. But though he was reared in the circles of royalty, and probably educated in all of the learning of the Egyptians and of other nations in intercourse with them, he did not forget the traditions of his people; and seeing an Egyptian maltreating a Hebrew, he slew the Egyptian, and fled the country, settling in the land of Midian, east of the Red Sea, where he married the daughter of a priest of that country. And after many years tending his father-in-law's flocks, he was called of God to lead his people out of Egyptian bondage, which he did successfully.

The story touching this tradition, and of the successful efforts of Moses in bringing the Hebrews or Israelites out of Egypt, to Sinai, where the law of Jehovah, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, was given them, is told in the books of Genesis and Exodus.

And we may conclude that the will of Jehovah found expression through Moses, substantially as recorded, Exodus 20: 1-17, that God said: "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.

"Thou shalt have no other gods before me.

"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in the heavens above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the waters under the earth.

"Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them; for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon their children unto the third and fourth generations of them that hate me. And showing mercy unto thousands of those who love me and keep my commandments.

"Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless who taketh his name in vain.

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work. But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day and hallowed it.

"Honor thy father and thy mother; that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.

"Thou shalt not kill.

"Thou shalt not commit adultery.

"Thou shalt not steal.

"Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

"Thou shall not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor's."

See Deuteronomy 5:6-21, giving the delivery from Egypt as the reason for the observance of the Sabbath.

The Hebrew conception of creation and Divine Immanence in the world opens to the compass of thought, two realms of being:

The Spiritual, involving the pre-eminence of God; and the Temporal, of things and events in time.

This revelation of the law at Sinai was an instance of the divine namicity, God, the Holy Spirit revealing, in or to the understanding of Moses, ascribed to God, the law of the spiritual realm, to man. But such revelation was in circumstances of the temporal, and the Bible sources describe it as embracing the statement of God on Mount Sinai, to Moses and the people of

Israel, about the third month after their deliverance from Egypt, amid thunder, and lightning, and heavy smoke. And thus, as usual, a spiritual revelation to man in circumstances of his understanding of temporal relations that enter into the traditional or historic narrative; and grounds of variances in different accounts. This may be seen in the narratives of the giving of the law at Sinai. For such accounts, see Exodus cc. 20, 22, 24, 25; and Deuteronomy cc. 4, 5.

These and many other laws were given to the people. But do not think that they depend on the arbitrary will of God; for we must think that God is as positive as the inevitability we see in natural law; and that it is in the spiritual relation of God and man that man's consonance to the spiritual realm obtains, and that involves Love.

In Leviticus 19:18, it is said: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." And in Deuteronomy 6:5, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thine heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy might." And in the story of the Good Samaritan, Luke 10:25-37, Jesus told a lawyer that he had answered rightly in stating the commandments, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbor as thyself."

And on another occasion, Jesus, being asked which is the greatest commandment, said: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." Matthew 22:37-40.

St. Paul wrote the Corinthians about the allness of love, saying, among other things, "Charity suffereth long, and is kind;

charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up. Doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil. Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth. Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things, Charity never faileth; but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away. For we know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away.

"When I was a child, I spoke as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man I put away childish things. For now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face; now I know in part but then shall I know even as also I am known. And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity." I Corinthians 13:4-13.

In later translations the word for Charity is translated Love. But the word "Charity" connotes so many aspects of benevolence as well as love, it has a charm for the practical thought and feeling.

St. John said: "Perfect love casteth out fear." I John 4:18. And again: "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." I John 3:14.

Thus is is seen that love is that finest of the emotional life that burns away the dross of selfishness, the vice of covetousness, and the vanities of life. And while prophecies and tongues may cease and knowledge vanish, Love quickens the soul to the image of God, and is eternal.

II.

Recurring to the History of Israel—There was established, first, in the wilderness, in a body of ex-slaves but recently from Egypt, a tabernacle system of worship, with its laws and ordinances, and its ceremonials and sacrifices under the administration of Aaron and the sons of Levi; with social laws touching the conduct of individuals with one another, and defining the rights of property,—all under the chief magistracy of Moses, and he under God, a theocratic form of government.

Touching the Bible story of these people, the same should be considered with respect to the situation of the people themselves. Their early culture was filled with traditions of a long past. However, their faith referred to a higher causality, although their positive knowledge of nature was so limited that they indulged many assumptions that are not defendable.

Such characteristics are more or less common to primitive peoples; and these Hebrews, also called Israelites, were, prior to their later enlightenment, not of a culture freeing them from many of the superstitions of their ancestors, or saving them from the emotions of such patterns of thought. They readily ascribed to God extraordinary events which may be thought by better informed peoples to be explainable upon natural grounds. Notwithstanding which, their faith in the over-all providence of God was well founded, regardless of many of their interpretations of particular events.

Nor may we rightly challenge the idea of miracle running through their thoughts; for the very idea of religion allows for the paramountcy of divine will and purpose, the like of which was realized in the long course of their history. And it should

be kept in mind that these Bible stories have a verity in their trueness to the emotional and religious life of Israel; both before and after the clearer voice of revelation at Sinai. To Israel, God was a law giver, and they were His subjects, whose duty it was to obey.

After approximately forty years wandering in the wilderness and in the regions east of the Jordan, Moses died, and the tribes were led by Joshua over to the west of Jordan, into the promised land; although it was a long time before they were of sufficient strength in the land to determine its laws and institutions.

Recurring to the faith and purpose of Abraham, and his conception of the promise of God, that in him all families of the earth were to be blessed, the experience of his descendants was so hard that, ethically, they fell below that ideal and had little sympathy for others than members of their own tribes, conceiving that Jehovah, the God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob, whom they covenanted, at Sinai, to obey, was only their tribal God, as distinguished from the gods of other peoples about them; and that Jehovah was a war god, hating their enemies with feelings like their own. The universality of the fatherhood of God was not realized until mankind was afflicted by the crises of many centuries. After the death of Joshua, and for centuries thereafter, the tribes were governed by judges, leaders arising in the respective tribes. The first monarchy was established under Saul about 1050 B.C. He was succeeded by David, the most distinguished of all of Israel's rulers; and he by his son, Solomon, who built the temple at Jerusalem, and who was distinguished for his wisdom, but who practically bankrupted his country, and greatly lowered its morals, before he died.

He left such a condition, and his succeeding son was so arrogant as to his future intentions, that the kingdom was divided,

the ten northern tribes rebelling about 937 B.C., and establishing what was thereafter known as the Kingdom of Israel, the northern kingdom, which continued until the fall, about 722 B.C., of Samaria, its capital, to the Assyrians, who carried the greater part of the people away, dispersing them among other Asiatic populations, until they were lost to history.

The southern Kingdom of Judea with its capital at Jerusalem, continued longer. The Babylonians, about 597 B.C., conquered Judea, and carried away to Babylon a large part, and the most vigorous part, of the population. And later, in about 586 B.C., they destroyed the temple and carried most of the remaining population to Babylon, where they remained in exile from their native land until the conquest of Babylonia by the Persians (538 B.C.), and a Persian king, Cyrus, permitted them to return to Jerusalem and rebuild the temple.

They were thereafter known as Jews. And the history of Israel may be regarded as beginning with the migration of Abraham and his entourage from the Euphrates country to Canaan, and to have ended with the forced return of his descendants to Babylonia.

The Jews, after their return from exile, enjoyed some liberty until about 333 B.C., when the Macedonian-Greek dynasty conquered the country, and holding the same until the Maccabean wars, in about 175 B.C. The Jews established their liberties in those wars, which they maintained until the Roman conquest in 63 B.C. And the Romans continued masters of the country until the advent and during the life of Christ, and for many years thereafter.

III.

The Prophetic Reforms—The time came when the priestly ministrations had accreted so many errors and superstitions in the temple and other worship, and had so emphasized ritual and form to the disparagement of spiritual values, that a number of prophets attacked the sacrificial system, or, rather, its abuses.

These laws of ritual and ceremony were passing elements in Israel's religion, but of divine purpose in the organization of the community and spiritual life of the people, and the administrations of the sacrifices and offerings.

But it is a characteristic of man to acquire regard for anything long associated with sacred uses, and to transfer the idea of sanctity to the most trivial things and practices. Such occurred in Israel, provoking a prophetic reform. Elijah was one of such prophets, appearing in the northern kingdom about 930 or later B.C., and he was followed by Elisha, Amos, Hosea, and others. Isaiah, the prophet, appeared in the Kingdom of Judea about 740 B.C. He was followed later by Mica, Jeremiah, and others, including Ezekiel, who was one of the young prophets carried away to Babylon in the first exile; where he prophesied.

Isaiah, denouncing the abuses of sacrifice, said in his day: "Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah. To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats.

"When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand, to tread my courts?

"Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting." Isaiah 1:11-13.

Hosea speaking the word of the Lord coming to him said: "For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings. But they like men have transgressed the covenant: There have they dealt treacherously against me." Hosea 6:6, 7.

And the voices of Amos and others were raised against the abuses. In Micah it is said: "He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" Micah 6:8.

In the fourth Psalm it is said: "Offer the sacrifices of righteousness, and put your trust in the Lord."

And in the fortieth Psalm: "Many, O Lord my God, are thy wonderful works which thou hast done, and thy thoughts which are to us-ward: They cannot be reckoned up in order unto thee, if I should declare and speak of them, they are more than can be numbered. Sacrifice and offerings thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened; burnt offerings and sin offerings hast thou not required."

And in Proverbs, 21:3-4: "Every way of a man is right in his own eyes; but the Lord pondereth the hearts. To do justice, and judgment is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice."

IV.

The Prophetic Idealism of Israel—The decline of the Kingdom of Judea, and the prophetic visions.

Jeremiah, when the political hopes of his country were fading, and the "Prince of Peace," of whom Isaiah had spoken, did not appear, realized that the temporal government of his people was going to pieces; but his faith did not fail, and he strove to encourage them with prophecies of better days, declaring among other things the word of the Lord, saying: "'It shall come to pass, that like as I have watched over them, to pluck up, and to break down, and to throw down, and to destroy, and to afflict; so will I watch over them, to build, and to plant,' saith the Lord. 'In those days they shall say no more. The fathers have eaten a sour grape, and the children's teeth are set on edge. But every one shall die for his own iniquity; every man that eateth the sour grape his teeth shall be set on edge.'

"'Behold the days come,' saith the Lord, 'that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them,' saith the Lord.

"'But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; 'After those days,' saith the Lord, 'I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people.'" Jeremiah 31:28-33.

In Hebrews 8:6, it is said that Jesus is the mediator of this better covenant.

This law of the heart is as true today as aforetime; evidencing that man is involved in a destiny requiring righteousness of him. We do not mean the physical heart; but that of the self in respect of its sentiments and willing motives and purposes.

Isaiah had spoken of the coming of the Prince of Peace, the

Messiah, in this wise: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end; upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." Isaiah 9:6, 7.

But Jeremiah could see that Israel was destined to suffer before the coming of the "Prince of Peace." And with her temple destroyed and her law defamed, the divine assurances could be realized only in laws of life itself, laws of the heart.

There is an apparent contradiction between the statement of Jeremiah, that every one shall die for his own iniquity, and the commandment that God is a jealous God, visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generations, of those who hate Him. But not so.

The law at Sinai was addressed to the whole of Israel, as to a corporate body, coming within the rigor of social control as well as to them as individuals. At that time the individual was submerged in his tribal relations, and did not have many rights of his own; the social group being thought of as a unit in its corporate character, a kind of corporate personality. It was the tribe that had plans and purposes and was of first importance, and was punished or rewarded by God; although the individual had some rights and responsibilities.

In addition to sacrifices and offerings prescribed for individuals, atonement were made for the people as a whole. That is, corporate Israel was regarded as sinning, requiring atonement.

Morality of the individual consisted largely in his observance of the customs and regulations of the tribe; and in refraining from exposing the tribe to hazard or difficulty by violating any prohibitions or in failing to observe the tribal requirements and customs. So the moral conduct of individuals depended much upon his fealty to the sentiment and customs of his tribe. And failing in that, he not only exposed himself to reprisal, but also his family. When Korah and his fellows rebelled against Moses, they and their families were destroyed. Numbers 16:20-25.

And when Achan concealed the booty that should have gone to the common control, a like fate befell him and his sons and his daughters, and every thing he had. Joshua, Chapter 7. But Jeremiah saw the day when this idea of corporate personality would give way to the ethical in social solidarity, and the justice that one should not suffer for the sin of another.

It is typical of Israel's early experience that only when the people were "distressed" by national defeat or plague or other disaster that they realized that they had grievously sinned, and their penitence was frequently a public rather than a private one, confessing the sins of their fathers as well as their own; therefore, the thought of sins of the people, in their national or corporate character, as well as of the offenses of individuals.

Ezekiel, in exile, prophesying in Babylon, said that the exiles would return to their native land; and in the word of the Lord: "'I will sanctify my great name, which was profaned among the heathen, which you have profaned in the midst of them; and the heathen shall know that I am the Lord,' saith the Lord God, 'when I shall be sanctified in you before their eyes.

"'For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land.

"'Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all of your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you.

"'A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh.

"'And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them.

"'And ye shall dwell in the land that I gave to your fathers, and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God.'" Ezekiel 36:23-28.

But the greatest voice of that age was that of an unknown prophet who arose in Babylon during the exile, who is frequently called the second Isaiah, because his prophecies are bound up in the book of Isaiah, chapters 40 through 55, with those of the first Isaiah, the Isaiah previously mentioned.

He did not give up the idea that Israel had sinned, and was, in her distress, suffering for such sins. And he evidently was aware of the punitive and ethical principles exemplified in the corporate lives of peoples, and likewise in that of Israel; that punishment follows sin, but that out of the same suffering may come the more enlightened mind and purer sympathies and purposes.

He, no doubt, was aware of the history and traditions of his people; and knew that while some of the kings of Judah had been noble and had walked in the statutes of the Lord, others had been wicked, oppressive; and, themselves sinning, had caused the people also to sin; and that through the stupidity or treachery of princes of the land it was frequently ravaged by wars and distressed by evil doings; that the wealthy oppressed the poor, that the proud humiliated the meek, and that holy things

and prerogatives and justice were sold for gain until the day they were carried away by the Babylonians.

It has been the history of many peoples that, while great errors have bruised the souls of individuals to better thoughts and living, the corporate whole nevertheless accumulated the elements of decay until all was lost. And the decadence of Israel seems to have been in natural course. And now she was despised and rejected of men, and the remnant of the people faithful to her traditions were exiles in a foreign land. Corporate Israel had broken down.

Obviously, God, as a God of Justice, is not indifferent to sin, and every offense entails its own punishment. It is true in nature that every departure from the appropriate laws applicable to an event in the natural world results in a less perfect result; and it is no less true in the moral world that misconduct leaves a hurt that can not be undone, though it may be forgiven. That is, the punitive is ultimately inescapable, notwithstanding the ethical may be realized in its sequence. But this prophet also realized that Israel had been a servant of Jehovah, his God, and had been entrusted with the oracles of God, and was even then a light to the Gentiles. And was not her suffering more than reformative? Was it not redemptive? Was it not in the plan of God that all families of the earth should be blessed through Abraham? And was not God's love itself a law with respect to righteousness? And may not a righteous offering overcome the blight of sin?

As he comforted the peole, he spoke of a Servant of Jehovah, and the pronouncement of the Lord, saying: "Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice

to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench: He shall bring forth judgment unto truth. He shall not fail, nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for his law." Isaiah 42:1-4.

Now, why should not the people hope, when these ideals were conceived as expressing the purpose of God?

But alas! Israel had sinned; and there is no compromise with sin. And we hear the prophet saying: "Who hath believed our report, and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed? For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground; he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him.

"He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief; and we hid as if it were our faces from him; he was despised and we esteemed him not." Isaiah 53:1-3.

To whom was the prophet referring? Was it to the corporate Israel, that conception of a people, the elect of God? Or Jacob or to Moses or some other individual? Or to an ideal servant of God with whom Jesus identified himself?

Let us pass these queries by, and see the picture then before the mind of the poet-prophet. Israel had been taught that sin and righteousness are different; and that a just God could not and would not tolerate sin; and that atonement must be made for any such infidelity to God. And that the law of love, softening the contraries of justice and mercy, in which the ethical principle of one sacrificing for the good of another is commended by the law of the heart, was the only assurance of God's continuing favor; for all else had failed. The only remaining assurance of faith was that God had shifted the sins they were unable to bear, upon another; upon this suffering servant. And the prophet says:

"Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.

"But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth. He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people he was stricken. And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth.

"Yet is pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands. He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities. Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sins of many, and made intercession for the transgressors." Isaiah 53:4-12.

And thereafter, this suffering servant, He who had so suffered for others, is made to proclaim, probably by the mouth of another prophet, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath annointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken hearted, to proclaim lib-

erty to the captives, and the opening of prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn; to appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness, that they might be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord, that he might be glorified." Isaiah 61:1-3.

And thus the Prince of Peace was conceived; not as ruling on the temporal throne of David, but in the hearts of mankind.

With the Hebrews, the just man was the one who observed the law; and it was inconceivable to them that God could be just if He were indifferent to sin, or that righteousness could have any significance if it had no quality distinguishing it from sin.

The prophet's expectation of divine mercy did not conceive a mitigation of their offenses, but stripes which another would suffer for their redemption.

No injustice in such solution seems to have occurred to him. He was sounding to its depth the ethical principle that one will choose to suffer for another; the dark way distressed parents have trod, the truly loyal have known, and in which love has given all.

He visioned a sublime sacrifice; for he was not only feeling for his own race, but also for all those for whom the promises to Abraham contained the hope; and that this servant of Jehovah would gain his own victory in such endowment of suffering.

Such is the principle exemplified through suffering, by our Lord Jesus Christ in revealing to mankind a righteousness without the law.

The Bible writers frequently interpret the sufferings of Jesus as atonement for the sins of men. But was it not more than that?

St. Paul said: "The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death."

Was it not the divine nature to reveal this Spirit to man in the circumstances of human life itself?

Now, we cannot fathom these questions by speculative thinking. Nor can we upon the basis of biologic law, explain the resurrection of Jesus; but upon the premise of the revelation of God through Him, that event was in the logical course of the same revelation, and in keeping with the meaning of the spiritual transcendentalism emphasized by Israel.

The subject of "Comparative religion" has received much attention in this critical age, as critics seek to find that which may seem to be common to all or to many religions.

In Greek and other mythologies impersonal forces were sometimes hypostatized as having personal traits—an impersonal force being turned into a person, and generating a myth.

Dionysus was, as representative of the vine, regarded as dying and coming to life again, like the earth in Autumn and Spring. And there is some authority that Adonis was thought to be a vegetarian spirit dying and coming to life again in the decay of nature in Winter and in its return to life in the Spring. And thus the drama of death and resurrection, to heighten the views of the poet, and to quicken the emotions of devotees of resulting cults.

Orpheus, a legendary character, supposed to have been the founder of Orphism or the Orphic cult, was supposed to incarnate the god, Dionysus, or some other deity.

Recurring to the idea of epistemological evolution the evolution of theories of knowledge; these and many instances in the broad fields of myths and superstitions reflect the urge of soul to find something eternal in the situation of life.

And the soul, looking out upon phenomena for such discovery, symbolizes as eternal something they see in the repetitions and circumstances of nature—something within the metaphysical limitations, as that necessary to completeness, and it reposes in a state of "make believe."

The Hebrew faith in God as that completeness was an approach to ultimate reality without the danger of defeat from the decay of some myth, as was revealed by the spiritual development of Israel through centuries of struggle, with ever increasing spiritual enlightenment, and the realization of righteousness of spirit without law, through Christ. Eternal principles of ethical content, rather than sensuous emotionalisms.

CHAPTER TWELVE

CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD

I.

THE IDEALISM OF ISRAEL WAS FULFILLED IN OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST—In Matthew 12:14-21, it is said of Jesus: When the Pharisees held council against Him, how they might destroy Him, He charged the multitude following Him that they should not make Him known, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias, the prophet, saying "Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall shew judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not strive, nor cry; neither shall any man hear his voice in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench, till he send forth judgment into victory. And in his name shall the Gentiles trust."

And in Luke 4:16-19, it is said that when Jesus came to Nazareth, "He went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read. And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book he found the place where it is written, 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath annointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance

to the captive, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised. To preach the acceptable year of the Lord.'

"And he closed the book, and he gave it again to the minister, and sat down. And the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him. And he began to say unto them, 'This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears.'"

In Acts, 8:26-35, it is said that as Philip went down from Jerusalem to Gaza, and on the way contacted an Ethiopian eunuch reading "the place in the scripture where it is said: 'He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb dumb before his shearer, so opened he not his mouth: In his humiliation his judgment was taken away: and who shall declare his generation? for his life is taken from the earth.' And the eunuch answered Philip, 'Of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself or some other man?' Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same scripture and preached to him Jesus."

In I Peter, 2:22-25, of Christ it is said: "Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously: Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed. For ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned to the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls." The Gospel by Matthew frequently interprets previous sayings as prophetic of his advent.

It is said in John 3:16: "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

And so the personal Christ, out of eternal love, revealed fully

the divine nature to mankind, and that the destiny involving man is not wasting effort, but of sublime purpose.

II.

Revelation of God in Christ—Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea, at about the beginning of our era; and spent His life in Palestine and its environs. (There is supposed to be a few years error in the calendar of our era.)

He suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried, and the third day He arose from the dead. See chapters, Matt. 28; Mark 16; Luke 24; John 20; I Corinthians 15.

St. Paul referred to him as "made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." Romans 1:3-4. And according to Matthew, he, being conceived of the Holy Ghost, was born of the Virgin Mary. A corresponding account is in Luke.

In Hebrews 1:1-2, it is said: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past to the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds."

Jesus, on one occasion, said to His disciples: "'Let not your hearts be troubled, ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also. And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know.' Thomas saith unto him, 'Lord, we know not whither thou goest; and how can we know the way?'

"Jesus saith unto him, 'I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me. If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also: and from henceforth ye know him and have seen him.' Philip saith unto him, 'Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us.' Jesus said unto him, 'Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayeth thou then, Shew us the Father?" John 14:1-9.

The disciples were thinking along conventional lines; but Jesus was speaking of God, the Father, in whom are all things, and we in Him; and of Himself, the truth and the life, the only way to the Father.

And He said further: "Believeth thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works. Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very works' sake." John 14:10, 12. —Thus the divine and human natures in the unity of the Son of God.

III.

The Humility of Christ—Touching His humility in life, He said to His disciples: "Whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister: And whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be the servant of all. For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." Mark 10:43-45.

It was the "Word," the Eternal Life which Jesus had with the

Father, and that had advanced the spiritual evolution of men through primitive wonderment, then through faith, and then through obedience to law, and now to a righteousness without the law, that was revealed to them in a life in the similitude of their own, and encountering temptations.

In Hebrews it is said: "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, 'crowned with glory and honor,' that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man.

"For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through suffering. For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, Saying, 'I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee.' And again, 'I will put my trust in him.' And again, 'Behold I and the children which God hath given me.'

"Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil; And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." Hebrews 2:9-18.

Touching the human conscience, the author of Hebrews, point-

ing the forms of the tabernacle and ceremonies under the former law, said: "Which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation.

"But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.

"For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth in the purifying of the flesh: How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself, without spot, to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?

"And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Hebrews 9:9-15.

St. Paul, in his letter to the Romans said: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God, Therefore, by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin.

"But now the righteousness of God without law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God.

"Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are passed, through the forbearance of God; To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Rom. 3:19-26.

St. Paul, after speaking of certain instances of his conduct, said to the Corinthians: "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge that if one died for all, then were all dead: And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and arose again. Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more.

"Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new. And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; To-wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation." 2 Corinthians 5:14-19.

Thus the idea of atonement, under the law, savors of penalty; but in respect of Christ, and His offering of Himself, it signifies reconciliation.

St. Paul said, Romans 5:8: "God commendeth his love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.

"Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. And not only so,

but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement."

Thus the travail of Christ in His becoming like unto His brethren in the flesh; condemning sin in the flesh; revealing the Father in the vicissitudes and circumstances of human life; and giving to them who believe on Him, power to become sons of God.

And in the First Epistle of John, it is said:

"My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: And he is propiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." I John 2:1, 2.

IV.

Sayings of Jesus—It is recorded that Jesus said: "I and my Father are one." John 10:30.

And again: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." John 5:19.

And, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy and my burden is light." Matthew 11:28-30.

"Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein." Luke 18:16, 17.

And in the Beatitudes:

"Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

"Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.

"Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth.

"Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled.

"Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.

"Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.

"Blessed are the peace makers: for they shall be called the children of God.

"Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

"Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you." Matthew 5:3-12.

These Beatitudes are from the Sermon on the Mount, in which Jesus spoke many other things; some of which are mentioned more briefly in the sermon on the plain, as recorded by Luke, as follows: "And he lifted up his eyes on his disciples and said: 'Blessed be ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God.

"'Blessed are ye that hunger now: for ye shall be filled.

"'Blessed are ye that weep now: for ye shall laugh.

"'Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake.

"'Rejoice ye in that day, and leap for joy: for, behold your reward is great in heaven: for in the like manner did their fathers unto the prophets.

"'But woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation.

"'Woe unto you that are full! for ye shall hunger.

"'Woe unto you that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep.

"'Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! for so did their fathers to the false prophets.

"'But I say unto you which hear, Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you.

"'And unto him that smiteth thee on the one cheek offer also the other; and him that taketh away thy cloak, forbid not to take thy coat also.

"'Give to every man that asketh of thee; and of him that taketh away thy goods asks them not again.

"'And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.

"'For if ye love them which love you, what thank have ye? For sinners love those that love them.

"'And if ye do good to them which do good to you, what thank have ye? For sinners also do even the same.

"'And if ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? For sinners also lend to sinners, to receive as much again.

"'But love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest: for he is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil.

"'Be ye therefore merciful, as your father also is merciful. Judge not, and ye shall not be judged: condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned: forgive, and ye shall be forgiven: Give, and

it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom; for with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again.'" Luke 6:20-38.

Jesus was thus teaching the motive and spirit of Christian conduct, and not indifference to evil or oppression.

The Christian spirit does not abate the Christian duty, although every such duty should be performed in that spirit. He Himself showed indignation and applied force in cleansing the temple of the despoilers making merchandise of the sacred place. And on another occasion He said He did not come to bring peace, but the sword; this in respect of the divisions and discords His truths would produce.

And he denounced with great force every form of hypocrisy and vice.

And on another occasion, and speaking in the apocalyptic style well understood in that day, He said: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats; and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundations of the world: For I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me.'

"Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, 'Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, and fed thee? Or thirsty, and gave thee

drink? When saw we thee a stranger and took thee in? Or naked, and clothed thee? Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee?'

"And the King shall answer and say unto them, 'Verily, I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethern, ye have done it unto me.'

"Then shall he say also unto them on the left-hand, 'Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels: For I was hungred, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not.'

"Then shall they also answer him, saying: 'Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, or a thirst, or a stranger, or naked, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee?'

"Then shall he answer them, saying: 'Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye did it not to one the least of these, ye did it not to me.'" Matthew 25 : 31-45.

The Christain benevolence in these doctrines is the basic ethical, and not emotionalisms that indulge the idle and profligate or attribute virtue to irresponsibilty. And St. Paul in writing to the Thessalonian Christains said that those who would not work should not eat. 2 Thess. 10.

Many may think that this reference to everlasting fire is not to physical fire; and that this is a parable of judgment that should be taken figuratively; but, upon whatever construction, it portends the desolation of a ruined soul away from God. And whether the term "devil," or its frequent equivalent "Satan," is a personification of entropy in spirtual decay, or means an extraneous evil agent, the result is the same.

And on another occasion when He, Jesus, had called the people

unto Him with His disciples also, He said unto them: "Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever shall save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's, the same shall save it." Mark 8:34, 35.

And before He left the disciples He said to them: "If you love me, keep my commandments, and I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." John 14:15-17.

And to the Jews who had believed on Him, "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." John 8:31, 32.

And again, He said to His disciples: "Yet a little while and the world seeth me no more; but ye shall see me, because I live, ye shall live also. At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." John 14:19, 20.—Thus an unfolding, not only of the divine nature, but of the spiritual estate of mankind as well.

After His resurrection He appeared to His disciples, and said: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Matthew 28:18-20.

V.

Christian Science—Christian Science, so called, is not admittedly a science, but a philosophic religious theory advanced by Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy, which she called Divine Methaphysics, a system of divine healing; a law of God, the law of good interpreting and demonstrating the divine Principle and the rule of universal harmony. *Rudimental Divine Science,* p. 1.

Mrs. Eddy was the author of the principal text book on the subject, *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures,* hereinafter referred to as Science and Health. And the reader's attention is called to pages of the same text by numbers in parentheses.

The metaphysical background of Christian Science,—Christian Science is an attempt to define a mystic nature; this in metaphysical conceptions of a Spiritual Life of which corporeal sense can take no cognizance. And such limits the thesis to consideration of the ultimate nature and relations of the fundamental concept of Spiritual Life of which such sense can have no cognizance; while man's general capacity for the cognizance of materiality is called "mortal mind," a phrase which is denounced as a solecism in language, and as implying that which is not true, and therefore unreal; and which is used in teaching Christian Science to designate that which has no real existence. That is, that Mind is one, God and his thoughts, including noumenon and phenomena; but "mortal mind" is not mind—leaving as valid only that power of cognition of which the synonyms are God, Spirit, Soul.

According to Christian Science, Mind (the divine Mind, the

only Mind) and matter are opposites, and both cannot be true. And, of course, that matter is "not true."

Christian Science claims that it reverses the false testimony of the physical sciences, that divine metaphysics reverses perverted and physical hypothesis about God; and that the illusion of mortal man, who cannot be an image of God, is illustrated by the mirage which makes trees and cities to seem to be where they are not.

The material senses are classed as illusory. And it is held that the five physical senses manifest beliefs of mortal mind, "affirming that life, substance and intelligence are material instead of Spiritual." And that these beliefs and their product constitute flesh that wars against Spirit; and that they are avenues and instruments of human error.

That what is termed material sense can report only a mortal, temporary sense of things. But the divine Principle of man—God the Soul of man, speaks through immortal sense; and spiritual sense can bear evidence only to the truth.

The material man of Christian Science is but a state of mind. He is not the objective man whom we know; it is held that such objective man, rightly considered, has a sensationless body, but "God, the soul of man and of all existence, being perpetual in his own individuality, harmony and, immortality, imparts and perpetuates these qualities in man, through Mind, and not matter." And that the only real sense of man is spiritual, emanating from the divine Mind; that the unnecessary knowledge gained from the five senses is only temporal—the conceptions of mortal mind; that the offspring of sense is not of Soul, Spirit, but symbolizes all that is evil, perishable, and that divine metaphysics explains away matter. And that the only reality about sin, sickness, and death is the awful fact that the unrealistic seems real

to erring human beliefs until God strips it of its disguise.

Christian Science claims to be a natural science, but not physical. Therefore, it pertains to a nature coming within the compass of the natural, but above the level of matter. Obviously it is not warrantable to introduce obliquely a supernatural God into a natural science, as a phenomenal element, however legitimate the proposition that God transcends but nevertheless effectively involves man; for that is the logic of namic transcendency. But Christian Science pretends only to the logic of "linear sequence."

That is, as in Brahmanism, Christian Science denies the validity of empirical knowledge of the material. And it was the idea of Mrs. Eddy, and it is a theory of Christian Science, that rationality is not deducible from material basis; but by looking away from matter to Mind as the source of every effect. And that Mind is the source of every effect. And that all men have one Mind, one God and Father, one Life, Truth, Love.

Harking back to the Platonic conception that the universal idea is the archetype of the real, and that particulars are real to the extent they participate in such ideas, the Christian Science type of philosophy, like Brahmanism and many other Oriental philosophies, implies that the essence of the particular is to be found only in the universal. All as one. However, Christian Science employs the term "God" with two different implications. Deity being too remote from human experience, a more immediate God is derived from humanity itself (72, 111, 114, 229, 268, 269, 270, 274, 278, 280, 284, 293, 300, 307, 309, 311, 330-333, 416, 472).

God is defined as Incorporeal, Divine, Supreme, Infinite Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, Love (465).

And it is said that the three factors,—Life, Truth, Love, constitute the triune person called God, the triply divine Prin-

ciple, Love (331). And these, —Life, Truth, Love, seem to perform the divine functions.

Mrs. Eddy denounced the testimony of the physical sciences and the prevailing hypothesis about God, and the phenomena of sin, sickness, and death; and concluded that the true Logos is Christian Science. Not because it is supernatural, or preternatural, or an infraction of divine law, but because she considered it the immutable law of God, good (134). The term "God", in this relation, means good. Examination of Christian Science literature discloses that one term is frequently followed by another, with no expressed relation between them. Such is a form of explanation by apposition, the second term explaining the meaning of the first; as, God, good. The latter term "good" explains that the term "God" is taken in the sense of good. Therefore, divine metaphysics, a system of divine healing, is a law of God, the law of good interpreting and demonstrating the divine Principle and rule of universal harmony. So the substance denoted by the idea God is *Good,* a moral principle.

And thus, God is brought within the compass of that which is natural to man; leaving the issue to depend on *What is natural to man?*

And it is a theory of Christian Science that God, the principle of divine metaphysics, is the "All in All," and an omnipotent good, denying sin, evil, disease, death, and that God is Spirit, Mind, Life (113). And it is said: "The Principle of divine metaphysics is God; the practice of divine metaphysics is the utilization of the power of Truth over error; its rules demonstrate its science" (111).

And it is part of the theory of Christian Science that Spirit, Life, Truth, Love, combine as one, and are the scriptural names for God; and that God is infinite, and ever present. That there is

no other power or presence; and that the spirituality of the universe is the only fact of creation.

And that God is Spirit, Mind, Life. That Mind, not matter, is the creator; and that Love, the divine Principle, is the Father and Mother of the universe, including man; that God is Love; and that without God, Love, immortality could not appear; and that Life, Truth, Love constitute the triune person called God; that is, the triply divine Principle, Love, representing a trinity in unity, three in one, the same in essence, though multiform in office,—God the Father-Mother, Christ the spiritual idea of Son-ship, and divine Science or the Holy comforter. That these humanities,—Life, Truth, Love, are the divine law givers, and express in divine Science the threefold essential nature of the universe; and indicate the divine Principle of Scientific being, the intelligent relation of God to man and the universe (113, 256, 312, 331-3).

And it is said that all men have one Mind, one God and Father, one Life, Truth, Love. And that an intelligence apart from man and matter, the eternal Mind or divine Principle, Love, governs the universe (270, 467). Thus the metaphysical principle, characteristic of the Oriental philosophies, of All as One. That a man and his neighbor are one, notwithstanding that empirical phenomena indicate that they are two; and that in loving his neighbor as himself he is only loving the one—himself and his neighbor.

With respect to God as creator, Christian Science presents a mystic relation of God and man. That is, while the material body and mind are temporal, the real man is spiritual and eternal; and that God, the divine Principle of man, and man in God's image, are inseparable, harmonious and eternal; not that they are the same; but in the order of divine science they co-exist and are eternal. God being the substance and man his image and likeness;

and that it is error to believe that man has existence or mind apart from God.

The theory is that the spiritual real man has no birth, no material life, no death. That he was not created from material basis, nor bidden to obey material laws not made by Spirit. But that he is the offspring of Spirit; that the beautiful, good, and pure constitute his ancestry; and that he is not like mortals in brute instincts. His province is in Spiritual statutes, in the higher law of Mind. Nor does he pass through material conditions prior to reaching intelligence. Spirit is his primitive and ultimate source of being.

And that the Science of being reveals man as perfect as the Father, because the Soul and Mind of the Spiritual man is God; and because he is governed by Soul instead of sense; by the law of Spirit, not by the so-called laws of matter. And his admission to himself that man is in God's own likeness sets him free to master the infinite idea; and "such conviction shuts the door on death, and opens it wide towards immortality." (42, 63, 71, 90, 301, 302, 307, 336, 337, 388.)

And it is the theory of Christian Science that ideas emanate from the divine Mind; and "that the universe is filled with Spiritual ideas which God evolves and which are obedient to him." That the divine Mind is the Soul of man, giving him dominion over all things; and that nothing is real or eternal—nothing is Spirit, but God and His idea. "And that in proportion as the belief disappears that life and intelligence are in matter, the immortal facts of being are seen, and their only idea or intelligence is in God."

The universe reflects and expresses the divine substance, Mind. Therefore, God is seen only in the Spiritual universe and Spiritual

man. Now, evil has no reality; it is neither person, place, nor thing; it is simply a belief, an illusion of mortal (human) mind. (71, 88, 279, 295, 300, 307).

This idealistic view of the relation of God and man brings the Spiritual man within the principle of linear sequence, because, man being co-existent and co-eternal with God, he has no beginning or end, and the logic of such state cannot allow the defects of human life.

The Spiritual Realm.—In Christian Science touching the visible and the invisible, the visible universe and material man are poor counterfeits of the invisible universe and Spiritual man. And the true idea of man as the reflection of the invisible God is as incomprehensible to man's limited senses as is man's infinite principle. Verities, that is Eternal things, are God's thoughts as they exist in the Spiritual realm of the real. Temporal things are thoughts of mortals, opposites of the real in the Spiritual and Eternal, and are unreal. Immortal man was and is God's image, the infinite expression of infinite Mind, co-existent and co-eternal with that Mind. He has been forever in the eternal Mind, God; which infinite Mind cannot be in man, but is reflected by man. The Spiritual man's consciousness and individuality are reflections of God; emanations of Him who is Life, Truth, Love. The immortal man has always been Spiritual and Eternal and never was material. Thus it is seen that the Humanities,—Life, Truth, Love, are made to perform mystic offices in this invisible universe, constituting Him, of whom the Spiritual man's consciousness and individuality are reflections (336, 337). And that Christian Science, properly understood, refers only to the laws of God and his government of the universe, inclusive of man, and to Mind, not matter (128).

And that, according to such laws, the only real sense of man is Spiritual, emanating from divine Mind; thoughts passing from God to man, but neither sensation nor report going from material body to Mind. That the intercommunication is always from God to his idea, man—the Science of being showing it to be impossible for Spirit or Soul to be in a finite body or for man to have intelligence apart from his maker (284).

The patterns of most Oriental mysticisms consist of mystic philosophies with complementary ideologies.

One of the ideas entertained by the Hindu, and by many others as well, is that of the transmigration of souls, or metempsychosis; the belief that a soul, upon the death of its existing body, is reborn in another animal or person; and continues the like repeatedly, in a wheel of births and deaths, until upon certain events touching their religious notions, the soul is reabsorbed in a universal soul.

Buddhism has the same fundamental conception, but with a more definite theory of the passage of the soul into a state called Nirvana.

Certain theosophies include the doctrine of reincarnation; the belief that an individual soul dies here, and after passing a time on a higher plane, is reborn to acquire further experiences, and thus advances or evolves from the lower to the higher.

However, it is the theory of Christian Science that no final judgment awaits mortal man; for the judgment day of wisdom comes hourly and continuously; even the judgment by which mortal man is divested of all material error (291).

This comports with the mystic conception of Christian Science touching the relation of God and man.

It must be kept in mind that Christian Science claims to be a natural Science, although idealistic, as if of the Spiritual processes

of a world whose activities are its own; and that it does not appeal to supernatural worth. Therefore, it must meet the tests of those epistemological principles essential to rationality.

The basic plot of Christian Science seems to be a conception that there is an ideo or psychic force residing within the person, but existing independently of material phenomena, which force is designated the divine Principle. And that this divine Principle in man speaks through immortal sense; that is, through God, the Soul and Mind of man; and that the body of the objective man, whom we know, is sensationless and his mortal mind worthless.

This upon the hypothesis that metaphysics is above physics, and that matter does not enter into metaphysical premises and conclusions. That the categories of metaphysics rest upon one basis, the divine Mind; and that metaphysics resolves things into thoughts, and exchanges the objects of sense for the ideas of Soul. (330, 268, 269.)

This discloses the reason for the Key to the Scriptures; the interpretations of Scripture by Mrs. Eddy, in which she resolves things into thoughts, and exchanges objects of sense for ideas of soul. In Christian Science, it is considered that the word "Soul" is properly used where the deific meaning is required, that is, where the word God may be substituted for it. That as used in Science, Soul is properly the synonym of Spirit or God. But when used out of Science, soul is identical with sense, with material sensation. (482.)

Touching the application of the Key to the Scriptures, it is said, Science and Health, 43: "The magnitude of Jesus' work, his material disappearance before their eyes, and his reappearances, all enabled the disciples to understand what Jesus had said. Heretofore, they only believed, now they understood. The advent of this understanding is what is meant by the descent of the Holy Ghost,

—that influx of divine Science which illumined the Pentecostal day and is now repeating its ancient history."

These considerations reflect the difference between two great philosophies,—the mystic philosophy of the Orient and the realistic philosophy of the West.

This Christian Science Trinity is represented as consisting of "God, the Father-Mother; Christ, the spiritual idea of sonship; and divine Science or the Holy Comforter." (331). Of course, the "Christ" only purports to be an idea. But Christian Science regards sin as only an idea. And this idea of a Christian Science trinity is developed showing this "Christ" to have prevailed, forgiving sin, before the personal Jesus; and that he is the divine idea dispelling the illusions of the senses; and is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, healing the sick, casting out evils, and destroying sin, sickness, and death. This Christian Science idea of "Christ" is given pre-eminence over Jesus, who is referred to as a prophet, while this Christian Science Christ is regarded as an Idea, Truth, and that such idea, though hypostatized as a being, was imperceptible to the so-called human senses, whereas Jesus appeared as a personal presence; and so, dual personalities,—the unseen and the seen, the spiritual and the material, the eternal Christ and the corporeal Jesus manifest in the flesh; and that such continued until the ascension of the Master when the human, material concept, Jesus, disappeared; while the Spiritual self or Christ continues to exist in the eternal order of divine Science, taking away the sins of the world, as the Christ had always done, even before the human Jesus was incarnate to human eyes.

That Jesus was the mediator between Spirit and flesh, between Truth and error, explaining and demonstrating the way of divine Science, and the way of salvation to all who accepted His word; that Christ, Truth, was demonstrated through Jesus to prove the

power of Spirit over the flesh,—to show that Truth is made manifest by its effects upon the human mind and body, healing sickness and destroying sin (331-337).

According to Christian Science, sin is merely an illusion; that there is no such thing as actual sin; and this exposition of a Christian Science Christ signifies no more than the theory that an adequate suggestion dissipates the illusion of sin; and not that there is a transaction in the forgiveness of sin, but that this idea, as well as any other dispelling the illusion, is a saving from sin, that is, a saving from such illusion.

Office of the "divine Principle"—Such so-called divine Principle is the active agent of the system; as in the metaphysical idea of a force residing within an object, but existing independently of the phenomena manifesting it. That is, the so-called divine Principle resides in man but it exists independently of all material phenomena, and, therefore, the dominant of man.

Touching divine healing, it is said: "The prophylactic and therapeutic (that is, the preventive and curative) arts belong emphatically to Christian Science, as would be readily seen if psychology or Science of Spirit, God, was understood." (369).—Thus psychology is exalted to a divine science.

Christian Science defines a metaphysical system; but, of course, constructed of abstract ideas, and denying all evidence that would give it credence, unless there is empirical evidence of healing, supporting it. But it has this mystic *touch* that makes it difficult to classify psychologically. Life, Truth, Love, and other human concepts are made to perform mystic offices in an invisible universe or Spiritual realm that has no supernatural sanction, and, therefore, no genesis except by the effectiveness of the human mind; which source Christian Science denies (X). And the so-called "divine Principle" can be no more than a psychic process

without divine sanction, however much religious ideas are spread throughout the system. And Mrs. Eddy, in the "Key to the Scriptures" seeks to bring the Hebrew and Christian concepts down to the metaphysical level.

Such depicts, substantially, the psychic states which Mrs. Eddy called divine metaphysics. But it must explain two important ideologies,—sin and divine healing.

It is part of the theory of Christian Science that physical healing results now, as in Jesus' time, from the operation of divine Principle, before which, it is claimed, sin and disease lose their reality in human consciousness and disappear as necessarily and naturally as darkness gives place to light and sin to reformation. And that such mighty works are not supernatural, but supremely natural. That they are the sign, Manuel, or God with us,—a divine influence ever present in human consciousness and repeating itself (XI).

Touching the ideology, Sin,—Christian Science denies that sin is actual; it classes sin among the illusions,—sin, sickness, and death. Christian Science holds that it is the material sense, and not the soul, which sins; and that it will be found that it is the sense of sin that is lost, and not a sinful soul. (481.) That all we term sin, sickness, and death is mortal belief. (278.) And that the divine method of paying sin's wages involves unwinding one's snarls, and learning from experience how to divide between sense and soul. (240.)

Christian Science is deficient in the categories of thought employed by Jesus. Notably in respect of sin. To Jesus sin meant actual sin,—any willful thought, word, deed, or omission contrary to the will of God; soul guilt as well as sense of guilt; and He told His disciples that He would pray the Father to send them another comforter; "and when he is come he will reprove

the word of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." John 16:8.

But the term has no such meaning in Christian Science. And since God is so confounded with man, the theory of that Science that the concept is a mere illusion implies that there is no will transcending man that he is free to disobey; for he has no will of his own, although he may suffer illusion of sin, a deficiency inhering in material sense until God strips it of its disguise. And the type of man thus presented in Christian Science, having no will but the divine Spirit speaking through him in immortal sense—God Himself, who cannot sin, leaves no basis for the idea of moral liberty, or responsibility for motive or conduct except utility and emotions, the ground accepted by all materialistic philosophies.

Therefore, it was necessary for Christian Science to depreciate the character of Jesus. The name "Jesus" was given our Lord at His birth; and He acquired, as significant of His character, the name Christ, meaning the Anointed One, the equivalent of the Hebrew Messiah. And St. Paul and other writers referred to Him as Christ, Jesus Christ, and our Lord Jesus Christ. And He was considered in Christian theology as one of the Trinity.

The realism of His revelation and of His conceptions of sin, complicated the problem for Christian Science; for it is basic in that Science that there is no such thing as actual sin, and that the divine Principle dissipates illusions of sin.

And that there is but one Spiritual existence,—the life of which corporeal sense can take no cognizance. That divine Principle of man speaks through immortal sense. And if a material body, that is, mortal, material sense, were permeated by Spirit, that body would disappear to mortal sense, would be deathless. (72.)

And the problem of Christian Science was further compli-

cated by the understanding that the people healed by Jesus were actually sick; an idea which Christian Science cannot allow.

St. Paul, in writing to the Colossian Christians, said: "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of man, after the rudiments of his world, and not after Christ. For in him dwelleth all of the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and we are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power." Col. 2:8-10. See, also, First Corinthians, Chapters 1 and 2.

Psychology is exalted to a divine Science. But physical healing is of the earth, earthy; and Christian Science is forced into the arena of human experience to vindicate such claims, and to deal with more than moral good.

There is Pragmatic good. Pragmatic good is that which is good for something; it is the good manifest in utility, with or without moral implications. It is the only good furnishing a standard for the operations of forces in nature, and making moral good possible. There is no universal harmony of the real in nature but in the fatality of natural forces destroying every ill or maladjustment in the way of broader useful relations.

The mechanisms of the real must, in the interest of such harmony, repeat their determined processes; and the buoyancy of life, realized in the vital, can sustain such unity only upon the conditions of living, healthy exponents.

Sickness and death are marks of the impermanency of the organism; that the finite is not all-sufficient in itself; and that nature must make eliminations in the only way of its successful repetitions, as if in consequence of an overpower in which determinate continuity obtains.

The tooth and claw of the lower animal, however ferociously it may employ them, are pragmatically good. Good for the de-

fense of itself and of its species. The forces destroying the tree in a forest, or the life of a man or of an animal, follow the inexorable in nature under given circumstances. The circumstances may be good or bad; but the pragmatic results are in the course of natural laws.

But man, with his rational intelligence and power to hurt or help more than in consequence of natural processes, would not well accomplish teleological purposes without the constraints of moral understanding and judgments and the finer feelings that environ his life. Therefore, he can attain to the excellency of worthy purposes only as he lives ethical and moral good.

So there are two kinds of good: the pragmatic, pertaining to the essentials of existence; and the ethical or moral good, essential in the carrying on of the creation above the levels of nature's endowments. It is the practical reason that can allow the relations of matter and spirit, and the paramountcy of God, within the purview of the good; understanding that pragmatic good is in the interest of the species, however harsh it may be to individuals; while the moral good ameliorates the harder situations of life, and tenders a basis for truth, justice, and love.

To ameliorate the harshness of the only harmony possible in nature, God has endowed man with intellectual understanding to be a co-worker in the phenomenal and social realms, and with moral liberty to escape this harshness of nature, so far as possible by the harmony of spirit, notwithstanding the mortal conflict that comes with the understanding of "good and evil." It is in such experience that man learn what is good by distinguishing it from what he must also learn to be evil. And it is inconceivable that there could be any such ideas as good or bad, or moral reasoning and judgments, if man's judgment of materiality were illusory.

It seems to be part of the theory of Christian Science that a person in the state of his material sense, and thinking himself sick, is merely harboring error. That he does not need to be cured of his sickness; for there is no such existent fact of sickness. And when his material body—his mortal, material sense, is permeated by Spirit, the divine Principle, that material body, with its error, is lost even to his mortal mind. That is, he realizes that he is not sick. No event except the patient's change of mind.

Now, the question arises, Is not this notion that the permeation of the divine Principle is necessary to such result an irrelevant assumption? *Science and Health* gives the following example:

On page 261, *Science and Health,* it is said: "The effect of mortal mind on health and happiness is seen in this: If one turns away from the body with such absorbed interest as to forget it, the body experiences no pain." And then is cited the instance of an aged, lame actor who "hobbled every day to the theater, and sat aching in his chair until his cue was called," when he became oblivious of his physical infirmity, sustaining his appointed task, and walking about as actively as the youngest member of the company. And this is cited as an effect of "mortal mind," that illusory something of the material man, without the interposition of "divine Principle."

And if the psychic buoyancy of the mortal mind can have such effect, it is difficult to see why some other principle must be invoked for no greater effects.

And in instructions to Christian Science Practitioners (see *Science and Health,* pp. 416, 417-420, and others), they are instructed to divert the patient's attention from body and supposed ailments to higher things; to teach them "that their being is sustained by Spirit, not by matter, and that they find health,

peace, and harmony in God, divine Love"; to explain to them the complete control which Mind has over the body, and how mortal mind seems to induce disease by fears and false suggestions, and how divine Mind can cure by opposite thoughts; and that they are not helpless victims, and that they can resist disease and ward it off, as positively as they can the temptation to sin.

It is said: "In their spiritual significance; Science, theology, and medicine are means of divine thought, which includes Spiritual laws emanating from the invisible and infinite power of grace" (118).

And it is said: "If from an injury or from any cause, a Christian Scientist were seized with pain so violent that he could not treat himself mentally, and the Scientist had failed to relieve him—the sufferer could call a surgeon who would give him a hyperdermic injection, and when the bodily pain was lulled, he could handle his own case mentally. Thus it is that we prove all things; (and) hold fast that which is good" (464).

It is difficult to see where Christian Science really involves more than a matter of psychic buoyance induced by suggestion. And since mind is the positive in relations with the servient functions of brain and nerves, it is not difficult to see how a psychic buoyancy, included by such suggestions as those made by Christian Science, may cause a sense of well-being. And that such effects come within the category of psychic effects induced by mental suggestions. Psychiatry and other aspects of mental medicine are recognized as sound research and practice.

The pessimist and faint of heart is often quickened to new spirit and hope by suggestions upon which his faith and hope can fix with confidence. And many have been the feats, unwarranted, apparently, by any logic, that have been accomplished

by those inspired by the will "to do or to die." And many have been the testimonies of healing, whether true or not, following psychic buoyancy induced by causes and issues having no relation to Christian Science. While phenomena induced by autosuggestion has long engaged speculative thought, and neither science nor philosophy have been able to set bounds to its possibilities.

Jesus said of Himself: "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, that also doeth the Son likewise." John 5:19. Therefore, the healings by Jesus are properly referable to God, the paramount transcending the patients, but nevertheless positive in such revelation of himself in Christ. This upon the assumption that the patient was actually sick, and actually cured by Jesus, as if such were a divine event.

But Christian Science does not allow that the patient is sick, and it attributes the healings it sponsors to no such providential agency; but to a change of the patient's understanding. But is not such a *drawing* on the same psychic reserve that is drawn upon by all men on occasions of deep conviction or intense concentration of thought?

Physical healing comes within the province of the positive sciences; and the great advance in medicine and surgery and the amelioration of suffering in hospitals and by other agencies leaves no open question on the subject, however beneficial religious ministry to the sick may be.

Christian Science is an attempt to spiritualize nature, requiring the denial of obvious objective reality. But God is more than the conjectural principle in such process, and more than the phenomena said to constiute a triune person called God.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

THE DIVINE IMMANENCE

I.

THE spiritual character and experience of mankind are significant of Divine Immanence in providential guidance, inspiration, and grace; and justify faith in a power of God, co-extensive with His Love, to fully reveal Himself in the vicissitudes of human life, in the manner given in the Christian story.

And it is recorded in the Prologue of John's Gospel that "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not.

"There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. The same came for a witness to bear witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of the Light.

"That was the true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.

"He was in the world, and the world was made by him; and

the world knew him not. He came unto his own; and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he the power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth." And thus the revelation of God in the circumstances of human life, in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The Apostle John, in the First Epistle, John 1:1, said: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life; For the life was manifested, and we have seen it and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us.

"That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye may also have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ. And these Things write we unto you, that your joy may be full."

Canon Farrar, in his *Early Days of Christianity,* says of this Text: "We have here the introductory theme of the whole Epistle. It should be compared with the golden prologue of the Gospel to which it is clearly analogous and the knowledge of which which it assumes. Though St. John seems to be laboring with the desire to express truth too great for the power of his language to utter, the clause, so far from being, as Calvin said, 'abrupt and confused,' is to the highest degree pregnant with clear and majestic thought; it compresses into a few lines a world of meaning, while at the same time it is steeped in the deep emotions of the writer.

"What he has to announce—for he only uses the plural as one of the Apostolic witnesses—is not the Word—but something respecting him—namely, that he is the Source from which all life streams. In hearing and meeting him, the Apostles had heard and seen this inward significance of his person and of his acts by the immediate perception of sense; and in gazing on and handling him, as they all did, and Thomas especially, after his resurrection, they had learned by yet fuller investigation, that he is indeed the Conqueror of Death and the Source of Life. And this Life of his was from the beginning, so the announcement of it is as though he were now inspired to write a new book of Genesis, but one which dated backwards to a yet earlier—nay, to an absolute eternity. Thus the 'From the Beginning' of the last book of the Bible repeats, but in even deeper tones, the 'In the Beginning' of the first book. The one speaks of the Incarnation, the other testifies to the Eternity, of him by whom the worlds were made.

"The proem of the Gospel that the 'Word became flesh,' because in the Gospel St. John is treating of Christ's person; but in the Epistle he says: 'the Life was manifested,' because he is about to deal, not directly with his Person, but with the influence which flowed from it, namely, Life. And the quality of that life is that it is eternal, stands in immediate relation to the Father, and was only manifested to man, in its priority and fullness, when Christ appeared. This was the Life which the Apostles had seen, to which they bore witness as true, which they were communicating to the world, and of which the assurance could be derived from their testimony."

In *New Testament in Modern Speech,* by Weymouth, the word for Eternal Life is translated "Life of the Ages."

It is recorded that angels sang at His birth, and that the wise

did Him homage. Yet He told Pilate that His kingdom is not of this world. And though He came unto His own, His own received Him not. Nor did the history of His time note His passing; leaving Him cherished only in the heart of those who loved Him. Surely "a plant from a dry ground"; but He brought life and immortality to light. And the fact of His resurrection presents no difficulty to faith; for nothing less than that would comport with the character of the Son of God.

Many authorities treat the psychology of religion as if the subject pertained only to the emotional life and the religious disposition of the individual without proper accentuation of those spiritual elements distinguishing it from ordinary experience. Life in its spiritual depth, is of the human soul, the soul in fundamental relations with the ultimate real, God; independent of speculative conclusions, however enlightening such speculations may be. But religious conversion is frequently erroneously referred to the category of ordinary experience, as in the conversion of one to this or that idea of no spiritual significance.

Jesus said: "Verily, I say unto you, Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." Matthew 18:3. This suggests that simple faith in God, like the faith of a child, are elements in religious conversion. It is the simplicity and absoluteness of the commitment that is significant; like unto that other statement of His: "Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God." Excluding the "double minded" man, who is unstable in all his ways, and the man of low or vicious ideas, suffering from forces tending to wasting values.

St. Paul, as if referring to himself personally, in a masterly analysis of the moral conflicts, and the significance of sin and

righteousness, said: "For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin." Rom. 7:14-26.

And in Chapter 8: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death."

This moral conflict in the human soul is quite manifest. And writing to the Philippians, Paul said, among other things: "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things." Philippians 4:8.

And Jesus said further: "Whosoever will save his life, shall

lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's, the same shall save it." Mark 8:35.

Man is continuously called upon to make decisions between issues of right and wrong. And shall he bring to such decisions merely ideas of expediency—that which would probably be best for him? Or bring to such decision the resolution to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with his God, though it hurts him and his? Such a resolution is a mark of the spiritual life, as distinguished from what may seem to be the prudent decision.

Man is addressed as having freedom of choice, a principle essential to any distinction between guilt and innocence, and necessary to develop human character and rectitude. Jesus came to reconcile man to God, to the better life; Himself suffering in His own body all that the law otherwise exacts of man, atoning for aught amiss, that man may save his life in the pattern of the life of Christ and His Gospel. And that is the highest revelation of God, and the philosophy of our Bible.

Jesus did not bring the existence of God the Father, under debate; nor set Himself up as a teacher of science or philosophy. But he emphasized the personal spiritual relation of God and men. A relation in a spiritual community of life where love is not withheld awaiting wisdom or theory, or denied the guilty penitent who realizes that he is a sinner, and prays in Holy sorrow for his forgiveness.

Intellectual systems may be instructive, but it is only in the filial relationship that man finds God.

Our Bible is the greatest collection of literature touching God in the experiences of peoples. Of course, such people were human beings, with human weaknesses and passions; and we should dismiss the idea of any artificiality about it. Our Bible is the

story of people struggling to find a higher than themselves, to succor them in their inadequacies and deficiencies. The light followed was the spiritual, discovering the laws of God written in the heart and accumulating inspirations of truth as they fervently sought after God. They, like other people, philosophized about it all, coming to many indefensible conclusions, later abandoned. But notwithstanding their variable experiences, that Bible is the great Book of Life, for the future, as it has been in the past, for it pertains to the spiritual life, important above all other subjects.

What are the difficulties of faith? That depends on the election one makes. If he elects to accept a materialistic philosophy as encompassing the whole of truth; such election is incompatible with such faith.

If he accepts the faith this Bible teaches, it explains the mysteries of life. God the Infinite of reality having as his principle the existence of the finite, endowing man with spiritual image of Himself and other characteristics epitomizing the nature of the world in which he lives; and revealing His laws written on the heart, and formulated, from time to time by prophets and holy men, for man's guidance; and the beneficence to be expected of such a God was manifested by His revelation of Himself in the circumstance of human life in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ; and such a Christ in such manifestation of the Eternal could not be holden of death; but lives eternally in the divine purpose of completing the spiritual lives of all mankind believing in Him.

II.

The Divine Immanence in the Office of the Holy Spirit—Jesus, before leaving His disciples, told them that He would pray the Father that He send them another comforter, "And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." John 16-8.

St. Paul said: "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." Rom. 14-17.

And to the Philippians he said: "Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others. Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus: Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and bebecame obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.

"Wherefore, God also hath highly exalted him, and has given him a name that is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Philippians 2:4-11. And to the Ephesians, in speaking of the union of Jews and Gentiles in Christ, He said: "For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father." Ephesians 2:18.

And in I Corinthians 6:19, "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own?"

And to the Galatians: "For brethren, ye have been called

unto liberty; only use not liberty as an occasion to the flesh, but by 'love' serve one another. For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.' But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another. This I say then, 'Walk in the spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lusts of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would. But if ye be led by the Spirit, ye are not under the law.'

"Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornification, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, sedition, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like; of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in the past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

"But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance: Against such there is no law.

"And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lust. If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit. Let us not be desirous of vain glory, provoking one another, envying one another." Galatians 5:13-26.

And after a discourse to the Romans on faith, St. Paul said: "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also; knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope: And hope maketh not

ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." Romans 5:1-5.

And again: "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Romans 10:10.

And to the Romans: "For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace. What then? shall we sin because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid. Knew ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom you obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?" Roman 6:14-16.

Notwithstanding the mandates of specific laws were no longer binding, the principle of fealty to God remained, and Paul warns them that they are servants of Him whom they obey, "whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness." And St. James carries the same idea further, in emphasizing righteousness as fruits of faith; and that without such works, faith is dead. James, Chapters 1 and 2.

And further:

"Wherefore lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls. But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves." James 1:21, 22.

The wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy. And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace." James 3:17, 18.

"For he that will love life, and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil, and his lips that they speak no guile: Let

him eschew evil and do good; let him seek peace and ensue it." I Peter 3:10, 11.

And Peter, in his Second Epistle (2:2-8) said: "Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord, According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us unto glory and virtue: Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises; that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust. And beside this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge. And to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; And to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity. For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ."

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

THE CHRISTIAN ETHIC

FAITH AND DUTY—Faith is an attitude of mind accepting as true that which is unseen, but of such probability that it is believed to be true.

Ethics is a branch of the theory of conduct, touching judgments of right and wrong; and of emotional, intellectual, and volitional phenomena, including the consciousness of obligations referable to standards or norms. That is, it is a normative science pertaining to rules or standards, and to what should be, rather than to that which is; and in that respect it is distinguishable from the factual sciences.

The general form of all descriptive knowledge, whether of physical or moral situations, is analytic; and most analyses recede in generalizations to a line where some kind of faith is initiative, the reasoning starting in a kind of faith. Rational cognitions are all of intellectual structure, pieced together by mind in patterns consonant with the faith that they are true of the real.

And in moral situations the thinker must consider every separate circumstance and the significance of each as well as all of them together in arriving at correct moral judgment.

And while physical situations present only impersonal inter-

ests intellectually considered; in the moral situation the conscience synthesizes emotions and judgments in sentiments of ideological force, requiring judgments of the person touching his own motives and conduct.

These are ethical processes, and ethics is a broad field into which man brings the problems of moral concern and interest, revealing a spirit order, superimposed on the common.

So intently and powerfully have human interests moved in these directions that other phenomena have been measurably subordinated to ethical and religious contributions in great movements and civilization. The speculative reason has, in all historic time, attempted to explain the mystery of the universe according to metaphysical principles, upon assumed logical premises, and upon many fantastic theories. But both philosophy and science must leave the ultimate answer to faith.

Religious Faith—Now, religious faith involves directly the element of trust in a transcending power, God, affecting the person in spirit relations, and inspiring man to a spiritual stature of a fullness of life in Him and ethical conduct accordingly.

Touching faith it is said: "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Hebrews 11:1.

This is translated in the Revised Version: "Faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen."

St. Paul said to the Ephesians: "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God, not of works, lest any man should boast." Ephesians 2:8, 9.

And to the Romans he wrote: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith; as it is written, 'The just shall live by faith.'" Romans 1:16, 17.

The object of this faith—We are told that Jesus, as a child, was obedient unto His parents; and that He grew in stature, and in favor with God and man. That at the Jordan at the time of his baptism, He told John the Baptist: "It behoveth us to fulfill all righteousness." And that, in the temptation in the wilderness, the story of which may be taken as epitomizing the passions of His whole life, He refused to exercise His extraordinary powers for His own benefit; refused to exploit His eminence by spectacles; and refused to worship Satan for the kingdoms of the world. He blessed the penitent, but passed the self-righteous by and denounced scribes and pharisees as hypocrites.

His was a peace for the sorrowing—healing the sick, giving sight to the blind, raising the dead, and preaching the gospel to the poor; but a lash and a sword for the wicked.

He dissociated Himself from all of the advantages of His own station, to suffer the ordeals of His human life and death for others; condemning sin in the flesh and bringing "life and immortality to light" in those who believed on Him.

He said: "God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and truth." John 4:24.

And touching the kingdom, He said: "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shalt they say, Lo here, or Lo there; for behold the kingdom of God is within you." Luke 17:20-21.

And of Himself He said: "I am the light of the world; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness but shall have the light of life." John 8:12.

"I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live. And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." John 11:25, 26.

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and

believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." John 5:24.

And again: "I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me." John 14:6.

And in I John 5:10-12, it is said: "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made him a liar, because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son; and this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life."

And according to that line of thought, St. Paul made a distinction between the spiritual life and the carnal mind, in an analysis which is itself convincing. He wrote to the Romans (Romans 8:1-17): "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit, the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of

God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his. And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin, but the Spirit is alive because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.

"Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh. For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the Spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Ab-ba, Father. The Spirit itself bareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God. And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified together."

St. Paul did not mean that flesh, as such, is bad; but he referred to the disposition to weaknesses and passions falling below the higher spiritual ideals; for he said (Romans 12:1, 2): "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God."

And to the Galatians he said: "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ." Galatians 6:2.

These excerpts from the Bible, hereinbefore appearing, are a few of their respective kinds; but thought sufficient to topic a correct line of thought and to point the reality of human rela-

tions with God, and the higher life whereunto man, in the mercies of God, is appointed. However, the thought of benefit is not in selfish feeling, but in love and motive for the benefit of all. And while the Gospels reiterate promises of individual benefit, we think they should be taken in the light of this saying of St. John: "And this is the confidence that we have in him, that, if we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us." I John 5:14.

Thomas à Kempis said: "The purpose of righteous men hangeth rather in the grace of God than in man's own wisdom; in him they trust always in all things that they do."

And Jesus, in the Sermon on the Mount, referring to the anxieties of mankind about what they shall eat, or what they shall drink, or wherewith they shall be clothed, said: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." And every person should organize his or her life with faith in that promise; not with the view of selfish aggrandizement, but in the view that God doeth all things well, whatever the circumstances of experience.

Our Bible is a wealth of literature touching the struggles of mankind on the plane of the vicissitudes of life, and in the search for God, and His inspirations giving them the deeper understanding of His will and righteousness, and of the victories, though frequently through suffering, of those abiding in Him.

And the Christian churches, corporate witnesses of God, point the way of a "righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith." But like all institutions affected by human weakness, there is ever a tendency to accrete errors; and they frequently differ over mere trifles; trifles that should be reconsidered in the light of more progressive thought, and thrown off.

But notwithstanding human errors, the true faith of the Christian can be nothing less than that the "Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world" will shine in the beauty of hope to the perfect day; and that it is for him to live in the Light.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

THE NEW TESTAMENT

I.

THE CANON—The New Testament is a collection or volume of the canonical books of the Revelation of Jesus Christ, and of history relative thereto.

The books of this canon were selected by the early church fathers during the early centuries of our era, upon the traditions of apostolic warranty or their intrinsic values, as the writings best perpetuating to man the true Gospel of our Lord.

Later, however, it was found that there are different facets of truth that could not be brought within the consistency of one system of human philosophy; and the church assumed the role of sole interpreter of them, thereby laying its authority upon the consciences of mankind.

The reformers denied this claimed infallibity of the Catholic church, and set up against it the claim of the infallibility of the Bible.

Thus the reformers also appealed to "authority" as binding the consciences of men; but referring that authority back to the scriptural canon, that had been built up by earlier men.

Now, it is perceivable that the Holy Spirit is not bound by dogma of the Catholic church or the judgments of the church fathers in settling the canon. But the inspiration and judgment of holy men, learned in the scriptures and seeking to discern the will of God, are to be considered with great care.

It is understood that the earliest of these writings were the letters or Epistles of St. Paul; and probably the first of these was his letters to the Galatians, about the middle of the First Century, A.D., and several years after the crucifixion of Jesus. And Paul thereafter wrote several letters to churches and persons.

Paul was a Jew, named Saul, of the city of Tarsus, in what is now called Asia Minor. His father had acquired Roman citizenship, and Paul was born a citizen of the empire.

He was not a disciple of Jesus, but he was educated in the doctrines and manner of life of the Jews, and was among the Jews at Jerusalem persecuting the early disciples after the resurrection of Jesus.

But on his way to Damascus, with authority to persecute the disciples there, he had a revelation of Jesus Christ that changed his whole course of life, and with the new life, the new name of Paul.

The Gospels, four in number,—Matthew, Mark, Luke and John were attributed to persons respectively so named.

Matthew, a Jew, also called Levi, was a collector of Roman taxes and called a publican at the time Jesus called him to follow Him. It seems to be a part of early tradition that Matthew prepared a statement of the sayings of Jesus, often referred to as the *logia* of Matthew; but his authorship of our Matthew in its present form is questioned. It is thought that the first of the Gospels was written by Mark. Mark is sometimes referred to as

John Mark and is supposed to have been a son of the Mary whose home was in Jerusalem, and who frequently entertained the disciples. He was a relative of Barnabas, a follower of Jesus, who vouched for Paul, after his conversion, assuring the Christians at Jerusalem that Paul then preached the Christ. And later, he and Paul being of the assembly of the Church at Antioch, that church set them apart as missionaries to Asia, young Mark going with them. But Mark turned back, and incurred such displeasure of Paul that, when he and Barnabas started on a second journey, and Barnabas wished to take Mark with them, Paul objected.

Thereupon, Paul and Barnabas separated, Barnabas taking Mark with him, and Paul taking Silas. But it seems that Paul, in his later years, esteemed Mark very highly. And it is said that Mark was a companion or interpreter of Peter, another of the great Apostles. On the whole, it seems that Mark was well qualified for the authorship of the first writing coming down to us, of the life and teachings of Jesus; and his Gospel is valued highly.

Luke was a gentile, but was a companion of Paul, for a time, and is referred to as the "beloved physician." The Gospels according to Luke and the Acts are attributed to him.

It is generally believed that the Gospel according to Matthew and that according to Luke were written after the Gospel according to Mark; for the reason, among others, that much of the contents of these Gospels seem to have been taken from Mark, or that the Gospel by Mark must have been among the sources on which Luke and the author of Matthew relied.

Touching the authorship of Matthew, in its present form, there is good opinion that the *logia,* or sayings of Jesus, kept by Matthew, were not in narrative form; and that these were later

introduced into a course of narrative accounts, after the manner of Mark; and that such accounts for the blending of material from the *logia,* Mark, and possibly other sources peculiar to Matthew. The final author of Matthew was a Jew; for he undertook to show, by many references, that Jesus was a fulfillment of the prophecies.

These three Gospels,—Matthew, Mark and Luke, are called the synoptic gospels, because of their similarities in telling the Christian story. But the Gospel according to John is so different in its interpretations and additional material, that it is considered apart from the synoptics. It was attributed to the Apostle John, as were the epistles of John, and the book of Revelation. It seems that John was, in his old age, with the church at Ephesis, probably the bishop or head of that church. But the book of Revelations for a long time attributed to John, differs so widely from the tone and spirit of the epistles and the Gospel, that John's authorship of these latter has been questioned, and the opinion advanced that, while the epistles and the Gospel are fine contributions to Christian interpretation and sayings of Jesus, they may be regarded as Johannine material formulated by a disciple of the Apostle, some elder, called John, or some one writing under the name of John; a pseudonymity common in that time.

But this writer is not capable of judging these matters, and merely mentions them as subjects inviting the student's attention and research.

But a distinction between one's philosophy and one's theology is sometimes noticeable. Paul was a legalist in his philosophy that the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus made him free from the law of sin and death; but he was not so in asserting that the liberty in Christ freed him from the law of command-

ment. Recurring to the idea of epistemic evolution; that is, evolution in theories of knowledge—the presuppositions of that which is fundamental or eternal, against which background every people have developed their current philosophies; we have seen such development through primitive wonderment, and through ages of pagan speculations to the simple faith of Abraham and his seed, and then under laws given by Moses and others, and the inspirations of the prophecies, until the advent of Christ, revealing a righteousness without the law.

Touching the limitations of knowledge, we have seen that the concept, the intellectual working tool of the individual, is quite rigid and exclusive in its meaning; but it may be used metaphorically; that is, its meaning transferred to another thing similar to that which it denotes.

Such is an implicit comparison, aiding the understanding; but the thinker is usually conscious that the word in its substituted use has a different shade of meaning, and that the use for such purpose is merely figurative.

When the similarity is expressed, that is, the similarity or likeness is indicated by such terms as *like, as, so, etc.*, the figure is called a simile. It is a comparison proper, as distinguished from a metaphor.

In addition to such rhetorical figures of speech, there are, in our New Testament, *carry overs* from Jewish thought, figures and symbolisms on the line of epistemic development or evolution.

The commandment to the first man, Adam, mentioned in Genesis, that in the day that he should eat the forbidden fruit, he "should surely die"; makes no distinction between physical and spiritual death. He did not die, physically, on that day; but

he suffered consequences which may be described as spiritual death. That is, the terms "death," may be so used metaphorically.

And until the time of Christ many Jews attributed one's sickness or other misfortune to sin. And many of the ills cured by Jesus were thought to be demons possessing the sufferer; and his healings were referred to as the casting out of demons or possessions; and that with his acquiescence. Today men think of such as mental or physical conditions. Did Jesus know the difference? The question is irrelevant; for if He had addressed them in the scientific language of today, they would not have understood Him.

Further, it was then thought that divine communications were made by messengers called angels; but Jesus left with his disciples the clear understanding that such ministries would be by the Holy Spirit, and that they should tarry at Jerusalem until they received such power from on High. And these beaten people, whose hopes had been so sorely crushed, emblazoned in the traditions of the Gospel the glory of Pentecost.

The Hebrew prophecies frequently contained references to last things,—condition of man after death, the destiny of peoples and nations, and the end or destiny of the world. This is called eschatology, teaching about last things and events.

The eschatology of the earlier prophecies pertained principally to the destiny of Israel, and the day of its consolation, and in some instances, the appearance of the Messiah in all of the glory of heaven, to sit upon the throne of David, and to rule the nations forever.

But as Israel's political hopes declined, they began to think that such consolation would come through a suffering servant of Jehovah, making atonement for the sins of the people. And

the eschatological thought was less about last things being bound up in the glory of the present world, and more about the destiny of individuals.

And after the passing of the great prophets, the spiritual Israel began to perish from lack of vision; but there was travail of soul, and the development of a new type of thinking, the apocalyptic. An apocalypse gives a situation in which the matter of moment—that which is important, is symbolized metaphorically in an aggregate of imagery; and in the apochryphal books—Jewish books not included in the scriptural canon, it is characterized by pseudonymity, present writers assuming the names of ancient worthies to give currencies to their books.

This type of literature seems to have attained its growth between about 200, B.C. and 100, A.D. Our book of Revelation is such type of literature, but its purported author is given as the Apostle John, of a vision on the Isle of Patmos, where he had been exiled by the Roman emperor.

The classic instance is seen in the vision of Daniel, chapter 7; the high lights of which are as follows:

Daniel had a vision in the night, a dream; this in the first year of Belshazzar, King of Babylon; and he saw the four winds of heaven break forth upon the great sea, and four beasts coming out of the sea. One was like a lion, the second was like a bear, the third like a leopard. And the fourth beast was terrible and powerful, and strong exceedingly; and having teeth and horns and eyes in such activities as boded evil.

And he saw thrones placed; and on one sat the Ancient of Days. "His garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like pure wool: his throne was fiery flames, and its wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand and thousands ministered unto him, and ten

thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened."

Thus, the wickedness and oppression of the beasts that had become men, met the inevitable; the books were opened, and they were brought to judgment. Such is the ideal of justice, often thwarted for a time; but deep in the wretched souls are the seeds of ultimate disaster.

And, in such vision, there "came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man." And he came before the "Ancient of Days," where he was given dominion over all things. The beasts sorely hurt the "Saints of the Most High," but they perished. And Daniel was informed, by one standing by, that the kingdom and dominion and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heavens would be given to the people of the Saints of the Most High; that such kingdom was an everlasting kingdom; and that all dominions would serve and obey Him.

This figure of the coming with the clouds of heaven, of one like unto the son of man, was a symbol of the infinite *moment*—the momentous of the vision, the "kingdom" under the dominion of the people of the Saints of the Most High.

Touching explanations, a distinction must be made between the apocalyptic, the theosophic, and the spiritual in the sum of Christian Ethics.

There are many theosophical theories; but common to them all is the pretense of wisdom about God; insight into the character and purpose of the divine mind; and knowledge of divine things. And specific systems of religion based on the notion that knowledge of divine things is gained by ecstasy, intuition, and many other processes.

A number of Jews had become resident in Egypt before the beginning of the Christian era. Among these was one Judaeus

Philo, who believed that God should be worshiped as a personal being, according to the Jewish scriptures. But he was also a disciple of Plato and Hellenistic in his philosophy; and he conceived that God is incorporeal and only cognizable by reason; that God is the most universal being, and that attributes ascribed to Him in scripture are only figurative. That God is not present in the universe in any essence, but only in his operations, and that these are attributable to an intermediary or intermediary congeries of forces between Him and the world, the Logos; the Logos containing in itself the potency of such operations, in powers and spiritual forms, themselves creative. And that such philosophy was in kind that of the Hebrew Pentateuch, which was inspired by God.

Philo was born about 20 B.C., and died about the middle of the First Century of the Christian era. And it is possible that the author of John's Gospel had in mind a refutation of such or similar dogma, in his doctrine of the "Word"; that the "Word" was in the beginning, and was with God, and was God, and became flesh and dwelt among us in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Recurring to the apocalyptic, the true Hebrew view seems to have been that the metaphor and imagery in apocalyptic situations were but introductory to, and the prelude in, the one apperception of the momentous, the activity of God.

The symbolic discourse is not to be construed literally; but it is revelation to those who understand the thesis and purpose; revelation of meaning otherwise hidden.

Such habit of thought carried over into New Testament literature. The book of Revelation is that type of revelation.

And one marked instance of the kind is seen in Chapters, Matthew 24, Mark 13, and Luke 21. Jesus, in the closing days

of his ministry, made a statement about the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem. And as he sat on the Mount of Olives (Matthew), or on the Mount of Olives over against the temple (Luke), his disciples,—Peter, John, James, and Andrew, came to him privately and inquired about when these things should happen? and what would be the sign when such things were about to be accomplished? or, as in Matthew, when such things would happen? and what would be the sign of His coming and of the end of the world?

Now, Jesus had spoken only of the destruction of the temple; but the inquiries of his disciples seem to have brought into the conversation eschatological elements, as well.

According to Luke, some had spoken of the temple, and about how it was adorned with goodly stones and offerings. And Jesus said: "The days will come, in the which there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. And they asked him, saying, 'Master, but when shall these things be? and what sign will there be when these things shall come to pass?'"

And returning to Matthew, there follows a long discourse (more abbreviated in Mark and Luke) touching the temptations and tribulations that would beset them, and admonishing them to remain faithful, and mentioning the suffering and desolation that would follow such events; and then the apocalyptic statement following: "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send

his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." Then follows the parable of a fig tree, and the statement of Jesus. "This generation shall not pass away, till all be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away."

"But, of that day and hour, knoweth no man, no not the angels of heaven, but my Father only."

Jesus taught, frequently, by parables; narrative statements of short stories or similes; presenting objectively that which was of no importance but for its ethical or spiritual significance. The "apocalyptic" statement is an enlargement of that idea; not to be construed literally, but signifying that which is of infinite moment, but which cannot be otherwise communicated to man.

This account of the statements of Jesus developed a situation of prophecy as to the destruction of the temple and the desolation that would follow. These factual pronouncements were fulfilled within the generation of persons then living, when in about 70, A.D., the Romans destroyed the temple, and drove millions of the Jews into the dispersion. But the "infinite *Moment*" of the apocalyptic discourse was the coming of the kingdom of God, and the succor of the saints. The image of the coming of the Son of man on the clouds of heaven was but a symbol of the coming of such kingdom, and, that, without an element of time except immediately after the factual desolation so foretold.

The idea of the "Son of man" and that of the "kingdom" are complementary parts of one apperception. The image, in a setting of objective power, emphasizing the causal, is the approach to the subjective realization of the kingdom in the hearts of the saints, and their succor and victory over the impending dangers. This latter is the momentous of the vision. In the gospel by

Mark, the coming of such signs signify that "He" is near, at the very door; while in Luke, it means the "kingdom of God" is at hand.

The several parables related to this revelation, in the three gospels, show that Jesus' words were Spirit, and not metaphysics.

And the conception of a second coming of Christ (who has come already in his kingdom) in a manner like unto a son of man coming on the clouds of heaven is mere imagery, which has failed for nearly two thousand years.

There is a reference in John's Gospel to the destruction of the temple, on the occasion of the purging of the temple, at the beginning of Jesus' ministry (John 2:13-22), that when the Jews asked Him by what authority he so acted, He said: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." And after His resurrection His disciples recalled this, and concluded that He had spoken of the temple of His body.

Now, the synoptics place a purging of the temple at the conclusion of His ministry, on the occasion of His last visit to Jerusalem (Matthew 21; Mark 11; and Luke 19); and some of them record His lamentation over Jerusalem.

The discourse of Jesus about the final judgment and the division of the sheep from the goats and the distribution of rewards and punishment is an apocalypse, symbolizing a divine order in which the spiritual life of man is continuous with his final judgment.

II.

The Traditions—We refer to the traditions, because the Gospels and many of the Epistles were written long after the close of Jesus' teaching. Probably some of the gospels and epistles were written more than a half-century after His death. The apostles and disciples in the meantime had no scripture but the Jewish scripture; and yet they, while holding to the spirit of these, developed a departure from their laws under the consciousness of the guidance of the Holy Spirit. They appealed to that test for the genuineness of their preaching and administration. And this through the changes of a generation. Most of those living at the time of Jesus had died; and others had grown old, and some scattered afar. So the new writings were little known until probably the latter part of that century, and possibly later. The Epistles of Paul were addressed to particular churches or persons, which probably delayed any very general understanding of them. So the scriptures were the Hebrew scriptures during the formation of the new thought.

The traditions differed as to the events of the crucifixion and of Jesus' intercourse after His resurrection. But they all agreed on the fundamental facts of the crucifixion and resurrection, and of His appearances after the resurrection, and some had the tradition of His ascent to heaven from their visible observation.

But Paul, whose conversion was after the resurrection, seems to have classed all such appearances in the category with the revelation to himself on the Damascus road.

Paul wrote to the Corinthian Christians: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ

died for our sins according to the scriptures; And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures: And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: And that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto the present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time." I Corinthians 15:3-8.

During the long interval before the particular doctrine of Christ was formulated in writing, the apostles and others went about preaching the Good News, and increasing followers. And as they reflected on the scriptures of their fathers, and on the revelations and teaching of Jesus, and of these ideals in the temper of human nature, and the hostilities that beset them, and the falseness of brethren, and the speculations of how all this could be, they acquired varying explanations of some things. And such varying explanations present the great problems of the traditions.

According to Mark (1:1-13) Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee and was baptized of John in Jordan. And "straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit like a dove descending upon him: And there came a voice from heaven, saying, 'Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.' And, immediately the Spirit driveth him into the wilderness. And he was there in the wilderness forty days, tempted of Satan; and was with the wild beasts; and angels ministered unto him."

Mark does not describe the kind of temptations.

But Matthew (Chapters 3 and 4) tells of the baptism; and of Jesus' experience in the wilderness in which the tempter admonished Him to change stones to bread, if He would prove his

Sonship, and Jesus replied, "It is written man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." And that the devil then took him into the holy city, and he sat him on the pinnacle of the temple, and said unto Him, "If thou be the son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, he shall give his angels charge concerning thee; and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at anytime thou dash thy foot against a stone." But Jesus said: "It is written, again Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God."

And that "Again the devil taketh him to an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; and said unto him, 'All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.' Then saith Jesus unto him, 'Get thee hence, Satan; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. And the devil left him, and angels came and ministered unto him."

Luke (3:21, and Chapter 4) refers to this baptism and the wilderness experience of our Lord, more briefly, but substantially as given by Matthew.

According to these Gospels, the descent of the Spirit on Jesus at the time of His baptism, and the voice from heaven, witnessed to Jesus his own sonship, and the pleasure of the Father.

But according to the Gospel of John (1:29 to and through 2:1), the descent of the Spirit, at the time of His baptism, identified Him to John the Baptist as the one "who should baptize with the Holy Spirit," so the Baptist could reveal Him to Israel. And it shows that Jesus remained at the Jordan for a short time, contacting others, some of whom later became disciples of His.

In the latter part of Jesus' ministry, when near Caesarea, Jesus asked his disciples, "Who do men say that the son of man

is." And they said: "Some say John the Baptist, others say Elijah, and others Jeremiah or one of the prophets." And He said to them, "But who say ye that I am?" And Peter declared that he was the Christ, the Son of God.

This pleased Jesus, and after commending Peter, and giving him a commission, He strictly charged them to tell no one that He was the Christ. Matthew 16:13-21.

Luke records a similar or the same episode, but without the commission to Peter. Luke 9:18-23.

Paul, in writing to the Colossians (1:15-20), referred to Jesus as the image of the invisible God; and the first-born of every creature, for whom all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers. That all things were created by and for Him; that He is before all things, and that in Him all things consist; that He is the head of the church, the first-born from the dead. "For it pleased the Father that in Him should all fullness dwell."

And in writing to the Philippians (2:6-8), Paul referred to Jesus as having been in the form of God, "But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of man: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death even the death of the cross."

Matthew and Luke enumerate miraculous events about the birth of Jesus.

According to Matthew (Chapters 1 and 2), the mother, Mary, who had been betrothed to Joseph, was before they came together, found to be with child of the Holy Spirit; and her husband, Joseph, being a just man and unwilling to put her to shame, decided to divorce her quietly. And while he slept, an angel of the

Lord appeared to him in a dream; and told him not to fear to take Mary, his wife; for that which was conceived in her was of the Holy Spirit; and that she would bear a son, and that Joseph should call his name Jesus; for He would save His people from their sins. Matthew conceived that such would be a fulfillment of the prophecy that "a virgin shall be with child and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emanuel (which being interpreted is God with us)."

And when Joseph awoke, he did as the angel commanded him. He took Mary, his wife, but he knew her not until she had borne a son; and he called his name Jesus.

The only mention of the place of His birth is that of Bethlehem of Judea; and that in the days of Herod the King. Then follows an account of wise men coming from the East, seeking one conceived to be king of the Jews, whose star, they said, they had seen in the east. And conferring with the king, Herod requested that they seek out the young child, and advise him so he could go and worship also. And being advised that Bethlehem was the place to search for the young child, the star went before them until it came over the place where the young child was. "And when they saw the star, they rejoiced with exceeding great joy. And they came into the house and saw the young child with Mary, his mother; and they fell down and worshipped him; and opening their treasures they offered him gifts, gold and frankincense and myrrh."

"And being warned of God in a dream that they should not return to Herod, the wise men departed into their own country another way."

Herod, in his wrath, plotted and finally executed the slaughter of such infants in that village as he thought would effect the destruction of this child. But the father was warned in a dream

to take the child and His mother and flee into Egypt, and to remain there until he was brought further word. This, the father did; making the flight in the night; and they remained in Egypt until he heard of Herod's death, and being advised by an angel of the Lord that he might return, safely, to Israel; he took the child and His mother, and started back. But when he heard that Archelaus was reigning over Judea in the room of his father; and being warned of God in a dream, "he turned aside into the parts of Galilee; and came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, 'that he shall be called a Nazarene.'"

The story of such birth, given in Luke, gives much attention to the parents of John the Baptist, and prophecies concerning him; and then (1:26) tells of an angel appearing to Mary, a virgin betrothed to Joseph, of the House of David—this at the City of Nazareth. And the angel seeing that Mary was disturbed by the first salutation, said to her, "Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found favor with God. And behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end."

And after many other events, the time came (2:1) for an enrollment under a Roman decree. "And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judea, unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and lineage of David, to be taxed with Mary, his espoused wife, being great with child." And it came to pass while they were there, the days were fulfilled that she should be delivered. And she brought forth her first born son; and she wrapped Him

in swadding clothes, and laid Him in a manger, because there was no room for them in the inn.

"And there were in the same country, shepherds abiding in the fields, keeping watch over their flock by night. And, lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them: and they were sore afraid. And the angel said unto them, 'Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David, a saviour, which is Christ the Lord. And this shall be a sign unto you; Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swadding clothes, lying in a manger.' And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, 'glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men.'"

And the shepherds went to Bethlehem, and found it so.

In Verse 21, the circumcision of Jesus, at the end of eight days, is mentioned; and that he was then named Jesus; and in Verse 22, is the account of their bringing Him to Jerusalem "to present him to the Lord," and of their other compliances with the laws of Moses.

And in Verses 39 and 40, it is said: "And when they had performed all things according to the law of the God, they returned into Galilee, to their own city, Nazareth. And the child grew and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him."

There is no account of a flight into Egypt, or of the reason given in Matthew for their residence in Nazareth.

The two accounts of this divine Advent, taken together, disclose revelations to both Mary and Joseph; though Matthew approaches the subject from the reactions of Joseph, and Luke from the reactions of Mary. And from Matthew's viewpoint,

wise men did homage to a king; but Luke conceived that the divine Chorus was heard by shepherds who adored the child in a manger as Christ the Lord. And between the last event at Jerusalem, above mentoned, by Luke, and his resumption of the Christ story at Nazareth, there intervened nearly twelve years, during which time the "Egypt" episode could have happened, but thought important only by Matthew who saw in it a fulfillment of prophecy.

Therefore, divergence of traditions in respect of incidents, and explanations of the prodigious, and minor circumstances naturally falling from more abbreviated repetitions through a long period of years; reflect that each gospel writer, while recording the story of the life and teachings of Jesus, and of His death and resurrection, and of His further converse with His disciples and men, spoke truly as he knew or had learned from apostles and teachers the Christian story, without collusion with others. And the remarkable consequences are the harmony, and agreement on matters of moment, of the four gospels.

Recurring to the great confession of Peter that Jesus was "the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matthew 16:17), "Jesus answered and said unto him, 'Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou are Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.' Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ.

"From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto his disciples,

how that he must go unto Jesrusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day.

"Then Peter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, 'Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall never be unto thee.' But he turned and said unto Peter, 'Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.'"

It is obvious that he did not intend to leave to Peter or to men the power to legislate touching the divine will, but only a Stewardship of the things of God; and that He never intended that His church should fall under the totalization of any body of men. And Paul, who more than any other apostle was the voice of God to the gentiles, told the Galatians that the gospel he preached to them was not man's gospel; that he did not receive it from man "For I neither received it of men, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." Galatians 1:12.

Jesus, in referring to Peter as Satan, hypostatized Peter's negative of righteousness as an agent of evil. Now, Satan or the devil was the villain in Hebrew drama. But God was paramount. In the afflictions of Job, Satan had to procure the consent of God to afflict Job, and the Lord limited the privilege to that of testing Job's fealty to God without destroying his life. Thus, in Hebrew thinking, a philosophic search for the basis of evil in a world, the creation of a merciful and just God. And it is the devil that is identified with the judgment of the damned in the apocalypse of the final judgment when the separation of the sheep from the goats is made. And in Hebrews it is accounted that the suffering and atonement of Jesus was to destroy the works of the devil who had kept people in fear of death. And

the synoptic gospels affirm that Satan tempted Jesus in the wilderness.

Thus, it seems that there is a state of human nature that is negative to righteousness, as when one is drawn away and enticed by his own lusts. James 1:13, 14. And such is so constant as to have evoked a postulate of sin from the very beginning of any thought on the subject. Adam's transgression has been imputed to his race; not in the particular manner, but in this disposition to sin and there is a conclusion that there is a constant—affecting human nature that is an agency of spiritual death, define it as you may.

Now, we cannot suppose that Jesus allowed himself to be taken to the pinnacle of the temple or upon some high mountain by a physical objective devil, during His temptations in the wilderness; but that His experience was an actual travail of soul in settling the great issues of His Messiahship. "For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted." Hebrews 2:18.

Unitarianism—There was a great controversy among the early church fathers about the person of Jesus, and his relation to the Father.

One Arius, an Alexandrian theologian, advanced the doctrine that the Son was not of the same substance or essence with the Father; thus calling in question the divinity of Christ, theretofore quite generally accepted by the Christian leaders.

And he received sufficient support for his doctrine to cause a great controversy among the Bishops and other prelates of the churches. And in 325, A.D., the Emperor, Constantine, called a great council of the church to be held at Nicaea, in Bithynia, Asia Minor, to settle the controversy.

The two factions, those called trinitarians, led by one Atha-

nasius, and the other including Arius and his followers, called Arians, met in about the first, if not the first, of the great ecumenical conferences which had so much to do with settling the dogma or doctrines of Christianity.

The Trinitarians contended for the formula of the "Holy Trinity"—One God, thus satisfying Hebrew monotheism, but three persons in that one,—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; that is, that these are one or the same essence or substance with the Father. But while the Arians did not agree in all things among themselves, they would admit only that the Son was of *like* substance with the Father. This was a metaphysical conception allowing only that the Father and the Son be classed as of *like* substance in respect of qualities bringing them within the same logical category. The decision of the Council was in favor of the Trinitarians, and such has been the doctrine of orthodox Chistianity to this day.

Now, this formula of the Holy Trinity is difficult to understand from the metaphysical viewpoint; but is sustainable in its spiritual significance of Eternal Life—God the Father incarnate in God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit in the office of such Life to man—the infinity of God in the divine manifestations of the real.

Arianism troubled the church through the ages, and survives in a modified form in the "Unitarianism" of today, denying the divinity of Christ, but setting Him apart as a great personality in the religious consciousness, teaching the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man; and allowing the Leadership of Jesus, salvation by character, and the progression of mankind forever. This characterization of Jesus as only a man makes the conception "man" the fundamental metaphysical concept within the limits of which the doctrine of unitarianism brings the ultimate nature

and relations of Jesus; and that major premise of its thought determines its Christian doctrine.

The Holy Spirit, in its office of that Eternal Life to man, was the interpreter to the disciples of the teaching of Jesus in their realization of a newness of spiritual life above that of philosophy and law and many of the teachings and traditions of their fathers, and which has been a great conquering force in the lives of men, warranting the conception of the transcendency of Jesus over mere man.

St. Paul, in his letter to the Ephesians (Ephesians 2:1-2), reminded them that Christ had made them alive when they were dead in the trespasses and sin in which they once walked, following the course of the world, the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that works in the sons of disobedience. And that he, Paul, and they once lived in the lusts of their flesh, doing the desires of their bodies and minds, and were, as were the rest, by nature children of wrath. But that God, out of his love, had made them alive together with Christ. And that they were saved by grace, through faith; and that such grace is the gift of God. And such has been the realization of millions to this day.

Now, such Reign of God is apprehended only by those persons who are spiritually seeking it; and the sequence is a gain of the believer and not merely an abstract idea of it. *Such Reign* of God is an earnest of Eternal Life.

And it is the supreme excellence of our New Testament that it records circumstances of a spiritual epoch in history, the idealism of which furnishes to faith the content that the completeness of a Life is to be found in its righteousness.

Marxism and Mohammedanism are movements, that should be noticed in this connection.

Marxism—The Philosophy of Karl Marx is a philosophy of realism in determination of an absolute spirit, such as the spirit of the Prussian state. But Marx related his reality to the spirit of the Proletariate, those whose only capital is their labor. And distinguishing these as a class, from what he called the capital class or bourgeoisie, having capital in lands or other forms of wealth; he and Friedrich Engels developed a materialistic philosophy, in a material interpretation of history as supporting an irreconcilable conflict of classes, and advanced the theory that the capitalist class exploits the working class by taking the surplus value of their labor in interest, rents, and profits.

And that the capitalistic state is not of merit with respect to the functions of a state proper; but that political power is derivative, depending for its existence and survival on needs forced on man by conditions of production.

And that the capitalistic state is merely a means of enforcing the capitalistic regime in the exploitation of labor. And that revolution and the exclusion of all other classes from the government, by force, if necessary, are rights of the Proletariate.

Of course, the materialistic interpretation of history is unsound, and the right of one class to continue such conflict systematically could only result in the ruin of society itself.

Marxism constitutes the basic philosophy of Soviet Communism; and the worthlessness of its ideals is seen in the facts that government is of that complexity, and usually armed with such military force, as in the Soviet Union, that the Proletariate, of any effective numbers, except such as may constitute a group of tyranny, are excluded from the government entirely, and left without any liberty of conscience, conduct, or enterprise.

The Monster of Totalitarian government is the greatest enemy of mankind.

The obviously better opinion is that the broader the base of political control in government, within the limits of responsible electorates, the better, and the more wholesome for all classes.

Russian Sovietism has made materialism a political dogma, striking at the very foundation of Christian civilization; and those who think that these two ideologies can be reconciled on grounds that would leave any meaning of the Christian religion show their utter misunderstanding of the issues involved.

Islam—Mohammedanism is the religion of a great part of mankind, and must have, in it, elements appealing to the religious aspirations of man. The Koran is its sacred book, containing purported revelations of a Supreme Being, Allah, to Mohammed, and that Mohammed was his prophet. Mohammed taught that the religion of Abraham was the true religion, but that it had been so debased by man that prophets appeared from time to time to restore the true religion. And that while such prophets as Noah, Abraham, Moses, and Jesus Christ had performed their respective missions, yet the time had come for another prophet with such commission, and that he was such prophet; and that, the later prophecies constituting the whole truth for man, his prophecies superseded all others. The movement began as a protest against the idolatries and superstitions of the Christians and Jews of that day; but retained, as central, the greatest idol of all, the Kaaba, the shrine of Mekka or Mecca, at Mecca, Arabia, inclosing the black stone, supposed from tradition to have descended from heaven, toward which Mohammedans turn their faces when praying. It is also the object of pilgrimages from the whole Moslem world.

III.

The Moral Concept—As has been said, the world should be considered as personalistic rather than as impersonalistic, whether it be regarded as an object of knowledge or as a working of causes and effects.

Touching the implications of such idea and the nature of the personalistic—the capacity of the person for moral decisions as distinguished from sense experiences and from intellectual discursive judgments touching the impersonal, and his unity in mind and namicity of spirit, reveal a positive state of being transcending matter and its mechanisms in the completion of the person, and that personality is a realistic principle. And it is inconceivable that the real in its entirety and adequacy of being, though known to us only in its particulars, can be less complete in respect of its larger functions than the person, who is only one of such particulars.

But when we attempt to describe the world, we realize that descriptive knowledge must analyze the whole of its conception to give us a fuller understanding of it than that of an object of knowledge. And in this case, the analysis of the concept "world" presents to us a working of causes and effects, the subject matter of the sciences; and that data may be related in various forms of knowledge.

But beyond that man is interested in the ideas that the world is an object of knowledge, and that it is, in its analysis a working of causes and effects, and that he is one of such effects, in which the material is but the habiliment, while he is personal self-hood or soul looking out upon the world as external to himself.

The whole together must be attributed to Eternal Might, the infinity of which puts it beyond the compass of a human concept, except as an intellectual representation, furnished by the productive imagination. And that is inadequate; for while it furnishes a transcendental that such disparate factors are normal in their patterns and arrangements, as in a cosmic order, the moral concept shows that it is personalistic also, in that the whole conditions converge, as if designed and controlled, not only by power, but by intelligent power, to the personal end. The ancients had no difficulty in thinking of such Infinite as God Almighty; and no better solution has been offered, though the sciences, caring only for such transcendental representation as explanation of causes and effects, assume an Absolute.

There was an age of religious Monolarity, that of many gods, frequently one for this or that tribe or area—called polytheism. Notwithstanding the conception also of one Most High God. And it is recorded that Abram (the early name for Abraham), in returning from the conquest of various eastern kings, was met by one Melkizedeck who blessed him, and to whom Abram paid tithes.

This Melkizedeck was king of Salem, interpreted king of peace and righteousness, and is described as a priest of the Most High God, and as without destiny, having neither father or mother, nor beginning of days or end of life, but who was made like unto the son of God. This Melkizedeck tradition persisted in Hebrew thought, and he was idealized in the Psalms as the expected Messiah of Israel, and in the Book of Hebrews, our Bible, Christ is referred to as a High Priest forever after the order of Melkizedeck, offering himself, once for all, for the sins of the world (Genesis, c. 14; Psalms, 110:4; Hebrews 5:6; 6:20; 10:5).

One name of the Most High God was *Elohim,* translated in our Bible "God." And Paul says that while death reigned from Adam to Moses, yet sin was not imputed to men, because there was no law. But at Sinai, Moses introduced God to Israel by the name of *Yahweh* or *Yahveh,* written in our Bible *Jehovah,* and also, translated through the Greek, *Lord;* therefore the concept, *Lord God.* Now, the Jehovah or Lord God of Sinai was a God of law, and therefore an early realization that the *moral* is of divine sanction, and that its violations entail penalties; which experience confirms.

But this God was an infinite object of thought, and could not be analysed in respect of his substance as Spinoza attempted to do, nor be explained except as the creator of all things and the moral governor of the universe. And this moral relation of God to mankind inspired prophets to foretell the coming of a Messiah bringing Him in closer relations to the fact and needs of human life; and philosophers to suppose that there was a Logos or reason of the universe, permeating it as a principle of its government, until the advent of Jesus Christ, in Israel, revealing the spiritual nature of God in the circumstances of human life in the earth, satisfying the highest moral expectations in the vitality of spirit saving people from sin.

And when Jesus spoke to his disciples about the many mansions in his Father's house, and that he was going to prepare a place for them, they seemed to think of the way and the place in terms of time and space. But he said: "If I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also." And Paul, in writing to the Corinthians, said: "We know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, that which is in

part shall be done away." And again: "For now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face; now I know in part but then shall I know, even also as I am known."

And Jesus said: "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life."

Therefore, an optimistic view of moral values; a Christian code of ethics that rightly appraises the spiritual as of the first importance; and a faith that "when this mortal shall have put on immortality," man may still know, even as also he is known.

And thus two bents of thinking; the logical within the purview of efficient causes—this within the realm of sense; and another transcending sense, and yet essential to a logical explanation of the moral concept essential to any worthwhile purpose of life and being.

And, therefore, the transcendental of spiritual life, and the simplicity of the Gospel of Christ when it is interpreted as pertaining to the spiritual life of man acquitting himself according to the will of God in the exigencies of this present life without superstitious fears or vain philosophies after the rudiments of this world and not after Christ.

And when we interpret rightly that Gospel, the spiritual appears justified upon grounds of its own, without the aid of metaphysical assumptions; and that it is in this relation of Spiritual Life that people may have the consolation of the peace of God.

IV.

Namic Philosophy—The disparity between the characters of things determined in a universe of being and conditions essential to such determinations is persuasive that the finite is involved in a causality transcending the limitations of phenomena.

According to the sciences, matter, mechanical force, organic life, intelligence, mind, etc., are treated as phenomena, and their dissimilarities are exposed to view. But according to the pragmatic formula, the values attributed to them are those having practical bearing in concrete situations. And since they are only partial views of the real, they would not be conceivable were they not of parts of a containing environment. And we must think of relations in terms of values.

And while phenomenal aspects of the finite exemplify the principle of linear sequence, metaphysical philosophy, other than as scientifically delimited, posits a concrete situation or whole as fundamental to its system of thought; as, Brahman in Oriental mysticism, One Substance in Spinozaism, an Absolute in Hegelianism, etc., as the instrumental containing the relations of constituent particulars, and thus pragmatism requires it to accept the principle of namic transcendency, or relations as reflected by the ascending scale of such principle.

But more fundamental than plans of the real intellectually conceivable is the eternal Positive or ground of being, which so far transcends the possibility of experience that metaphysical speculations are irrelevant and can give no explanation of the unity of matter and spirit in personality. That unity is infinite, determined in the eternal order of nature by a power not manifest in

the phenomenon, but nevertheless effecting the creation, and in that relation to the human spirit that its laws are written in the heart. This is a substantial Hebrew-Christian conception, transcending the limitations of metaphysical thought.

And the person, conscious that truth, as such, is important, can not be brought within the mere value category of pragmatism; for he discloses dual personality,—the temporal being of the individual, and a spiritual character, justifying the conviction that things of plan and the human soul in its moral liberty are determined by the same ultimate cause; that spirituality is the paramount principle of being; and therefore, God.

The early Christians epitomized their faith and the unfolding revelations of God to man in the concept of the Holy Trinity. They accepted the Hebrew conception of One God, Infinite and above all things, the creator of heaven and earth, revealed to the Hebrews and to them through the prophets. But they had a new revelation of God in Christ. The Son; the son of God; and the further experience of a new life in Christ, through the office of the Holy Spirit. They would not allow that either of these experiences was less than an experience of God. And, instead of contradicting the Monotheism of the Hebrews, they magnified it in the much larger conception of God in human experience.

They had no difficulty in thinking of God, first as infinite, the "Word"; and then of him as Father, in whom are all things and they in him; and of the same "Word" becoming flesh in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ; and the same in the Holy Spirit reproving the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment. Now, the intellectual views of reality are circumscribed by mental limitations, but faith seeks to find the ultimate spiritual reality. It is in this latter state that ideals are entertained and the spiritual life of mankind is realized, with its moral under-

standing and courage in the vicissitudes of the individual and in the organization and conduct of society; and it is in this respect that man lives and moves and has his being in God.

In conclusion: The idea of creation implicit in the concept of namic transcendency is the intellectual linkage between that of the existence and linear sequences of finite things and the eternal positive of the universe of *being;* while the ideas of sin and righteousness, each the opposite of the other, are fundamental concepts in any sound thinking. And we submit the foregoing as an attempt to present the working of forces in relation to human experience and destiny.

INDEX

Aaron, 134
Abraham, 73, 135
Abram, 225
Absolute, 225
Absolute Infinite Power, 72
action, 9
action, dynamic, 9
aesthetics, 98
aesthetics, transcendental, 36
affections, 97
a Kempis, Thomas, 196
Altruism, 115, 116
Ammonius Saccas, 66
animal life, 87
apocalypse, 204
apochryphal books, 204
apperception, 40
a priori judgment, 35
a priori knowledge, 22, 35
a priori proposition, 23
Archelaus, 215
Archetype of the real, 63
Arians, 220
Aristotle, 12, 14, 50, 57
Aristotle, theories of, 12
association psychology, 115
atomism, 27
atoms, 27, 80
atonement, 140
atonement, idea of, 109
Attribute, 62, 63, 64, 65
Attribute of Extension, 25, 62
Attribute of Knowledge, 62
Attribute of Thought, 25

Bacon, Francis, 33
Barnabas, 200
Beatitudes, 157
behavior, 91
behaviorism, 89, 90
Bentham, Jeremy, 115
Bergson, Henri, 29, 39, 100
Berkeley, George, 28
  exponent of idealism, 28
Bethlehem, 214
Bible, 186
biogenesis, law of, 71, 85
biology, 118
bion or living thing, 11
blood brotherhood, idea of, 109
body, interaction with mind, 89, 92
Bohr, Neils, 80
Book of Life, 186
Bosanquet, Bernard, 67
Bowne, Borden B., 69
Brahma, 66
Buddhism, 169

Canon, 198
carnal mind, distinction from spiritual life, 194
categories of modality, 39
categories of quality, 39
categories of quantity, 39

categories of relations, 39
change, 60
charity, 133
Christ, 155, 156
Christ, the Son of God, 154, 158, 160
Christian Ethic, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197
Christian Science, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 170, 172, 173, 174, 178
Christian Science Practitioners, 177
Christian Science Trinity, 171
church, 198
commandment to the first man, 202
Comte, Auguste, 23, 56, 108, 112, 115, 117
cognition, 23, 95
cognition, metaphysical, 43
cognition, principle of, 28
cognition, sensory, 24
cognitions, elements in, 40
conation, 95
concept of Holy Trinity, 229
conceptions, 37
concepts of reason, 24
concrete universal, 67
conditioned whole, 59
consciousness, 24, 91
consciousness of moral liberty, 18
corporate personality, idea of, 141
cosmic order, 25
cosmology, 18
council of Nicaea, 219
covenant, 139
creation, idea of, 20, 61
critical philosophy of Immanuel Kant, 34
critical realism, 33
Critique of Pure Reason, 36
crucifixion, 210

Daniel, 204
Darwin, 116
David, 135
deduction, 47, 50
Democritus, 27
Descartes, 25
determining will, 104
Deuteronomy, 131, 132
devil, 160
Dewey, John, 54
dialectic process, 31
distinction between spiritual life
dissolution, 107
and carnal mind, 194
Divine Healing, 172
Divine Immanence, 131, 180, 187
Divine Metaphysics, 162, 173
Divine Mind, 167, 169, 170
Divine Nature, 64
Divine Principle, 172, 174, 177
doctrine of final cause, 21
doctrine of form, 13
doctrine of ideas, 13
doctrine of reincarnation, 169
dynamic action, 9

Eddy, Mary Baker, 162, 164, 165, 173
effects, multiplication of, 107
ego, 28
egoism, 116
Eleatics, 60
electrical theory of matter, 80
principle of, 80, 82
electro-mechanical equivalence,
Elijah, 137
Elohim, 226

emergent evolution, 70
empirical intuition, 37
empirical knowledge, 22,35
empirical propositions, 23
empiricism, 33
Empiricism, Radical, theory of, 34
energetics, 76
energy, 9, 12, 27
energy, conservation of, 77
energy, heat, 78
Engels, Friedrich, 222
entropy, 78, 79
epiphenomalism, 89
epistemological realism, 27, 32
epistemology, 22, 94
Epistles of John, 201
Epistles of St. Paul, 199, 210
eschatology, 203
eternal life, 182
ethics, 114, 191
Eucken, E., 69
evolution, 102
evolution, theories of, 103
extension, 93
extension, attribute of, 25, 62
Exodus, 130, 132
Ezekiel, 141, 142

faith, 191
Farrar, Canon, 181
Fichte, 28, 98
Fichte formula, 29
final cause, doctrine of, 20
finite real, 7
First Cause, 15
First Epistle of John, 156
force, persistence of, 107
form, 13, 110
form, doctrine of, 13
formal reasoning, 50
formula of the Holy Trinity, 220
free intelligence, 100
freedom of choice, 185

Genesis, 123, 130
genetics, 83
genus, 46
Gestalt school of psychology, 90
God, 128, 135, 141, 164, 165, 166 167
God, a law giver, 135
God, St. Paul's conception of, 16
God, the Father, 16, 152
Gospel according to John, 201, 209
Gospel of Christ, 227
Gospels, 199
Greek doctrine of the Logos, 61

Hamilton, Sir William, 69
heat energy, 78
Hebraic ideas, 121
Hebrew conception of creation, 131
Hebrew conception of one God, 229
Hebrew Pentateuch, 206
Hebrew Prophecies, 203
Hebrews, 109, 134, 146
hedonism, 115, 116
Hegel, G. W. F., 30
  idea of an Absolute, 30
  philosophy of, 31
Heraclitus, 60, 61
Herder, J. G., 68
heredity, 83
Herod, 214
Hindu ideas, 169
Hindu philosophy, 66
Holtz, R. H., 68
Holy Spirit, 203, 221

Holy Spirit, Office of, 187
Holy Trinity, concept of, 229
Hosea, 138
Hume, David, 33
hylozoism, 70
hypostatization of ideas, 14
hypothesis, amendment of, 49
hypothesis, preliminary, 49
hypothesis, theory of, 49

idea, 29, 68
idea of atonement, 109
idea of blood brotherhood, 109
idea of corporate personality, 141
idea of creation, 20, 61
idea of emergent evolution, 70
idea of recapitulation, 105
"Idea" in consciousness, 30
ideas, doctrine of, 13
ideas, hypostatization of, 14
ideas, transcendental, 43
illusion of sin, christian science, 172
immanent reason, 61
immortal sense, christian science, 163
individuality, laws of, 87
induction, 47, 48
inertia, 26
infallibility of Bible, 198
Infinite Cause, 21
infinite Moment, 208
innate intelligence, 100
instinct, 91, 99
intellect, 17, 29, 98
intelligence, 36, 38
  free, 100
  innate, 100
intention of the particular, 64
interaction of body and mind, 89,
  empirical, 37
  pure, 38
  sensuous, 40
intuitions, 37, 100
  92
intuition, 29, 37, 38

Ionians, 60
Isaiah, 74, 137, 144, 145
Islam, 223
Israel, 137, 139, 142, 143, 144
Israelites, 134
Israel's notion of God, 72
issues of right and wrong, 185
James, William, 34, 54, 55
Jehovah, 143
Jeremiah, 139
Jesus, 109, 118, 126, 132, 139, 146, 150, 151, 171, 173, 179, 183, 184, 185, 196, 206, 208, 211, 212
Jews, 136
John, 161
John the Baptist, 215
Joshua, 135
judgment *a priori*, 35

Kant, Immanuel, 22, 38, 39, 40, 43, 97
Kant, Immanuel, Critical Philosophy of, 34
Kant, Immanuel, table of the categories, 40
  table of principles, 40
Key to the Scriptures, christian science, 170, 173
kingdom of God, 209
kingdom of Israel, 136
kingdom of Judea, 136
knowledge, 24, 33, 57
knowledge *a priori*, 22, 35

knowledge, empirical, 22, 35
knowledge, positive, 23
knowledge, "transcendental," 35
Koran, 223

Lamark, 105
law of biogenesis, 85
law of commandment, 201, 202
law of the spiritual realm, 131
laws of individuality, 87
Leibnitz, 68
Levi, 134
Leviticus, 132
life, 11
life, definition of, 111
linear sequence, 58, 62, 71, 154
linear sequence, logic of, 51
living soul, 9
living thing, 9
Locke, John, 28, 33
logia of Matthew, 199, 200
logic, general, 42
logic of "linear sequence," 51
logic, transendental, 41
logical quantity, 64
Logos, Christian Science, 165
Logos, Greek doctrine of, 61
Logos of the universe, 60
Luke, 132, 149, 156, 200, 212, 213, 215
magnet, 80
man, 185

Mark, 152, 199, 211
Marx, Karl, 222
Marxism, 222
Mary, 213, 215
mass, 9
material sense, 163
materialism, 69
materiality, 24
matter, 9
matter, electrical theory of, 80
Matthew, 132, 149, 150, 151, 156, 157, 160, 161, 207, 211, 213
maya, 66
mechanical equivalence, 10
principle of, 75
mechanism, 76
meliorism, 114, 116
Melkizedeck tradition, 225
Mendel, The Abbott, 83
Mendelian theory, 83, 105
Messiah, 140
metabolism, 86
metaphor, 202
metaphysical cognition, 43
metaphysics, 18, 94
metaphysics, field of, 63
metempsychosis, 169
Micah, 138
Mill, James, 115
Mill, John Stuart, 115
Mind, 97, 163, 164
mind-body problem, 89
mind, interaction with body, 89, 92
Mohammed, 223
molecules, 80
monads, 68
monolarity, 225
moral concept, 224
moral liberty, 98
moral liberty, consciousness of, 18
mortal mind, 162, 177
Moses, 129, 130, 131
multiplication of effects, 107
mystic conception of Christian Science, 169

Nirvana, 169
naive realism, 33
namic, 8
namic philosophy, 228
namic transcendency, 11, 20, 59, 75, 93, 121
namicity, 8, 11
namicity of spirit, 224
natural law, 7
natural science, 164
nature, 7
Neo-Platonism, 66
neo-realism, 33
New Testament, 198, 202
non-ego, 29
noumena, 8

offerings, 109
Omnipresent, 112
ontology, 18
organism, 11
  activities of, 84

Paley, Archdeacon, 115
parallelism, 89, 91
parallelism in biology, 105
percept, 29, 98
perceptions, 33
"persistence of force," 107
personal self, 91
Peter, 190, 200, 213, 217
phenomena, 23
phenomena, universe of, 40
phenomenon, 7, 37
Philip, 150
Philo, Judeaus, 205
physical healing, 173
physico-chemical forces, 79
Pierce, A. C., 54
Plato, 13, 63
Plotinus, 66
Porphyry, 58
positive, 8
positive knowledge, 23
potential of species, 59
practical reasoning, 52
pragmatic and ethical or moral good, 176
pragmatic good, 175
pragmatic philosophy, 54
pragmatism, 54
predicables, 58
primal cause, 59
primary qualities, 28
Prime Cause, 13
primeval Being, 67
Prince of Peace, 146
principle of cognition, 28
principle of electro-mechanical equivalence, 80, 82
principle of transcendentaism, 43
proof, 52
prophetic idealism of Israel, 138
prophetic reforms, 137
proposition *a priori,* 23
propositions, empirical, 23
psychology, 19, 95
psychology, Gestalt school of, 90
psychology of religion, 183
pure concepts, 22
pure intuition, 38
purposes of categories, 39
Pythagorians, 60

quality of the species, 12
quantum theory, 82

race experience, 110
radical empiricism, theory of, 34
real, 7
real, finite, 7
realism, critical, 33

realism, epistemological, 27, 32
realism, naive, 33
realism, neo-, 33
realism, representative, 33
reality, 16, 23, 25, 63
reality, sole, 60
reality, substantive, 64
reason, 98
reason, concepts of, 24
reasoning, formal, 50
reasoning from analogy, 48
reasoning, practical, 52
receptivity, 37
Reid, Thomas, 98
Reign of God, 221
reincarnation, doctrine of, 169
relation of God and Man, 168, 169
religion, 72
religion of humanity, 112
religious faith, 192
representative realism, 33
response, 90
resurrection, 210
Revelation of God in Christ, 151
Revelations, 201, 204

Sabbath, 123, 131
sacrifices, 109
St. James, 189
St. John, 133, 196
St. Paul, 16, 74, 121, 122, 132, 147, 154, 155, 160, 183, 184, 187, 188, 192, 194, 201, 210, 213
  conception of God, 16
Saint-Simon, 115
Satan, 218
Saul, 135
sayings of Jesus, 156, 157, 159, 161
scale, 48
Schelling, F.W.J., 68
Schopenhauer, Arthur, 68
scientific ethics, 115
secondary qualities, 28
sensations, 97
sense percept, 24, 91
sensibility, 17, 36, 37, 38
sensory cognition, 24
sensory consciousness, 91
sensuous intuition, 40
sequences, uniformity of, 7
Sermon on the Mount, 157, 196
sickness and death, 175
simile, 202
sin, 125, 173
sole reality, 60
Solomon, 135
Son of man, 208
soul, 43, 170
soul, living, 9
sound, 24
species, 46
Spencer, Herbert, 106, 110, 111, 112, 113, 116, 117
  theories of, 106
Spinoza, 30, 60, 62, 64, 65, 72
spiritual life, distinction from carnal mind, 194
spiritual realm in Christian Science, 168
spiritual sense, 163
spiritual transcendentalism, 147
stimulus, 90
Stoics, philosophy of, 61
subaltern series, 48
substance, 8, 25, 62, 63, 64
substantive reality, 64
sui generis, 47

Supreme Good, 115
syllogism, 50
synoptic gospels, 200
taboo, 108

teleology, 55
teleology, theory of, 21
Theories, 12, 62, 106
  of Aristotle, 12
  of Spencer, 106
  of Spinoza, 62
theories of evolution, 103
theory of Christian Science, 165
theory of teleology, 21
theory of radical empiricism, 34
theosophical theories, 205
thermodynamics, first law of, 77
thermodynamics, second law of, 78
thought, attribute of, 25
thought, 75, 93
totem, 109
traditions, 210
transcendental aesthetics, 36
transcendental analytic, 36
transcendental ideas, 43
"transcendental" knowledge, 35
transcendental logic, 41
transcendentalism, principle of, 43
transcending namicity, 104
transmigration of souls, 169
trinitarians, 219, 220

unamic entity, 11
unant, 11
Understanding, 38
uniformity of sequences, 7
unitarianism, 219, 220
unity of substance, 69
universal unity, 60
universe, 26
universe of phenomena, 41
Unmoved Mover, 13
Upanishad, 66
utilitarianism, 117

Vedanta school, philosophy of, 66
vision, Daniel's 204
vitality, 82
vital-positive, 15

Weissmann, 105
Weymouth, 182
wholism, 27
will, 18, 68
world, concept of, 224

Yahveh, 226
Yahweh, 226

Date Due

NOV 3 '80			
[redacted]			

BD701 .E53
The Namic philosophy : a philosophy of
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00103 8803